# STUDIES IN GREEK AND ROMAN RELIGION

EDITED BY H. S. VERSNEL

IN CO-OPERATION WITH F. T. VAN STRATEN

VOLUME 5

# THE CHALDEAN ORACLES

TEXT, TRANSLATION, AND COMMENTARY

BY

RUTH MAJERCIK

E.J. BRILL
LEIDEN • NEW YORK • KØBENHAVN • KÖLN
1989

**Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data**

Julianus, the Theurgist.
[Chaldaean oracles. English & Greek]
The Chaldean oracles: text, translation, and commentary / by Ruth Majercik.
p. cm. — (Studies in Greek and Roman religion, ISSN 0169-9512; v. 5)
English and Greek.
Bibliography:
Includes index.
ISBN 9004090436
1. Oracles—Early works to 1800. I. Majercik, Ruth Dorothy.
II. Title. III. Series.
BF1762.J8413 1989
181'.6—dc20 89-9896
CIP

ISSN 0169-9512
ISBN 90 04 09043 6

© *Copyright 1989 by E. J. Brill, Leiden, The Netherlands*

*All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced or translated in any form by print, photoprint, microfilm, microfiche or any other means without written permission from the publisher*

PRINTED IN THE NETHERLANDS BY E. J. BRILL

*TO RICHARD*

# CONTENTS


Preface ..... ix
Abbreviations and Short Titles ..... xi

Introduction ..... 1
General Remarks ..... 1
I. Theology ..... 5
A) First Principles ..... 5
B) Lesser Beings ..... 8
1. Iynges ..... 9
2. Connectors ..... 10
3. Teletarchs ..... 11
4. Angels and Demons ..... 13
5. Aion and Eros ..... 14
II. Cosmology ..... 16
III. Anthropology ..... 19
IV. Soteriology ..... 21
A) Conjunction ..... 25
B) Conjuration ..... 26
1. Animation of Statues ..... 26
2. Binding and Loosing ..... 27
C) Magical Instruments and Objects ..... 29
D) *Anagōgē* ..... 30

Text and Translation ..... 47
Fragments ..... 48
Various Chaldean Expressions ..... 120
Doubtful Fragments ..... 130

Commentary ..... 138

Bibliography ..... 222
Index ..... 230

# PREFACE

An earlier version of this work was presented as a Ph.D. Dissertation at the University of California at Santa Barbara in 1982. The present version (slightly revised) has benefited from consulting recent publications; e.g., Glenn Morrow's and John Dillon's translation of Proclus' *Commentary on Plato's Parmenides* (Princeton, 1987), Carlos Steel's second volume of Moerbeke's Latin translation of Proclus' *Parmenides* (Louvain, 1985), and recent scholarship (through 1988) on the *Oracles*, Neoplatonism, and related material. Regretfully, volume five of Saffrey-Westerink's Budé edition of Proclus' *Platonic Theology* was not available to me when this manuscript went to press.

My thanks go to Birger Pearson, my thesis advisor, who first suggested this project to me and skillfully guided the original thesis to completion and who has remained a valued friend and colleague; to Joseph Margon and Alva Bennett, who also served on my doctoral committee and were instrumental in developing my early interest in Greek and Latin; to Gregory Shaw, for his insightful comments and stimulating conversation over the past several years; to Randi Glick and Marilyn McCarty, who carefully typed the original manuscript; to Randall Smith, whose expertise in both classical languages and computer technology made it possible (and pleasant) for me to convert this manuscript to Nota Bene. I also wish to thank H. S. Versnel and F. T. van Straten for accepting this work in their *SGRR* series and Julian Deahl, Brill religion editor, for his advice and patience. Mr. Theo Joppe is to be acknowledged for his skill and speed in bringing this book to completion.

Personal thanks of love and appreciation go to my family; my daughter, Andrea, and my sons, Christopher and Geoffrey and their families. Most of all, I wish to thank my husband, Richard Comstock, for his unfailing good humor, patience, and support. It is to him that this book is lovingly dedicated.

# ABBREVIATIONS AND SHORT TITLES

For full citations, see bibliography.

| | |
|---|---|
| *AJP* | *American Journal of Philology* |
| *Allogenes* | *Allogenes* (NHC XI,*3*) |
| *Ann.* | *Annuaire pour l'encouragement des études grecques en France* |
| *Anon. Taur.* | *Anonymus Taurinensis* |
| *ANRW* | *Aufstieg und Niedergang der Römischen Welt* |
| *Ap. Jas.* | *The Apocryphon of James* (NHC I,*2*) |
| *Ap. John* | *The Apocryphon of John* (NHC II,*1*) |
| Arist. | Aristotle |
| *De an.* | *De Anima* |
| Arnobius | Arnobius |
| *Adv. nat.* | *Adversus nationes* |
| *Asclepius* | *Asclepius 21-29* (NHC VI,*8*) |
| Augustine | Augustine |
| *Conf.* | *Confessiones* |
| *BG* | *Papyrus Berolinensis* 8502 |
| *C.H.* | *Corpus Hermeticum* |
| *CMAG* | *Catalogue des manuscrits alchimiques grecs* |
| Cod. Bruce, *Untitled* | *The Untitled Text* in the Bruce Codex |
| CR | Classical Review |
| Cremer | F. Cremer, *Die Chaldäischen Orakel und Jamblich de mysteriis* (1969) |
| *CQ* | *Classical Quarterly* |
| Damascius | Damascius, *Dubitationes et Solutiones de Primis Principiis in Platonis Parmenidem* |
| Damascius, *In Phaed.* | Damascius, *Commentary on Plato's Phaedo* in L. G. Westerink, ed., *The Greek Commentaries on Plato's Phaedo*, vol. II (1977) |
| Des Places | É. Des Places, *Oracles Chaldaïques* (1971) |
| Des Places, "Notes" | É. Des Places, "Notes sur quelques *Oracles Chaldaïques*" in *Melanges Delebecque* (1983) |
| *Disc. 8-9* | *The Discourse on the Eighth and Ninth* (NHC VI,*6*) |
| Dodds, "New Light" | E. R. Dodds, "New Light on the 'Chaldean Oracles' " (*HTR*, 54, 1961; rpt. Lewy², 1978) |
| Dodds, "Theurgy" | E. R. Dodds, "Theurgy and its Relationship to Neoplatonism" (*JRS*, 37, 1947; rpt. in *The Greeks and the Irrational*, 1957) |
| *Enc. Univ.* | *Encyclopaedia Universalis* |
| *Entretiens Hardt* | *Entretiens sur l'Antiquité Classique*: Fondation Hardt |
| *Exc. Theod.* | *Excerpta ex Theodoto* apud Clement of Alexandria |
| Eurip. | Euripides |
| *Iph. Taur.* | *Iphigenia Taurica* |
| Eusebius | Eusebius of Caesarea |
| *P.E.* | *Praeparatio Evangelica* |
| Festugière, *Rép.* | A.-J. Festugière, *Proclus: Commentaire sur la République*, 3 vols. (1970) |
| Festugière, *Rév.* | A.-J. Festugière, *La Révélation d'Hermès Trismégiste*, 4 vols. (1950-1954) |

| | |
|---|---|
| Festugière, *Tim.* | A.-J. Festufière, *Proclus: Commentaire sur le Timée*, 5 vols. (1966-1968) |
| Geudtner | O. Geudtner, *Die Seelenlehre der Chaldäischen Orakel* (1971) |
| *Gos. Eg.* | *The Gospel of the Egyptians* (NHC III,*2* + IV,*2*) |
| *Gos. Truth* | The Gospel of Truth (NHC I,*3*) |
| Hadot, *Porphyre* | P. Hadot, *Porphyre et Victorinus*, 2 vols. (1968) |
| Hermias | Hermias |
| *Phaedr.* | *In Platonis Phaedrum Scholia* |
| Hesiod | Hesiod |
| *Theog.* | *Theogonia* |
| Hierocles | Hierocles |
| *In aur. carm.* | *Commentarius in aureum carmen* |
| Hipp. | Hippolytus |
| *Haer.* | *Refutatio omnium haeresium* |
| Homer | Homer |
| *Il.* | *Iliad* |
| *Od.* | *Odyssey* |
| *HTR* | *Harvard Theological Review* |
| Iambl. | Iamblichus of Chalcis |
| *Comm. In Parm.* | *In Parmenidem* in *In Platonis Dialogos Commentariorum Fragmenta*, ed. J. Dillon (1973) |
| *De myst.* | *De mysteriis* |
| Iren. | Irenaeus |
| *Adv. Haer.* | *Adversus haereses* |
| *1 Jeu* | *The First Book of Jeu* in the Bruce Codex |
| *JHPh* | *Journal of the History of Philosophy* |
| *JRS* | *Journal of Roman Studies* |
| Lobeck, *Aglaoph.* | C. A. Lobeck, *Aglaophamus* (1892; rpt. 1964) |
| Julian (Emperor) | Julian (Emperor) |
| *Or.* | *Orationes* |
| Kroll | Wilhelm Kroll, *De Oraculis Chaldaicis* (1895; rpt. 1962) |
| Lewy | Hans Lewy, *Chaldean Oracles and Theurgy* (1956; new ed. 1978 = Lewy$^2$) |
| Lucian | Lucian of Samosata |
| *Philops.* | *Philopseudes* |
| Lydus | Jean Lydus |
| *De mens.* | *De mensibus* |
| Macrobius | Macrobius |
| *In Somn.* | *In Somnium Scipionis* |
| Marius Victorinus | Marius Victorinus |
| *Adv. Ar.* | *Adversus Arium* |
| *H.* | *Hymni* |
| *Marsanes* | *Marsanes* (NHC X,*1*) |
| NHC | Nag Hammadi Codex |
| *NT* | *Novum Testamentum* |
| Num. | Numenius, *Fragments*, ed. É. Des Places (1973) |
| Olympiodorus | Olympiodorus |
| *In Alc.* | *In Platonis Alcibiadem Priorem Commentarii* |
| *In Phaed.* | *In Platonis Phaedonem Commentaria* |
| *Orig. World* | *On the Origin of the World* (NHC XIII,*2*) |
| *Paraph. Shem* | *The Paraphrase of Shem* (NHC VII,*1*) |
| *Orph. Fr.* | *Orphicorum Fragmenta*, ed. O. Kern (1963) |
| *Orph. Hymn* | *The Orphic Hymns*, ed. A. Athanassakis (1977) |
| *P.G.* | *Patrologia Graeca*, ed. J. P. Migne |

| | |
|---|---|
| *PGM* | *Papyri Graecae Magicae*, ed. K. Preisendanz (1963-1964) |
| Philo | Philo of Alexandria |
| *De migr. Abr.* | *De migratione Abrahami* |
| *De opif.* | *De opificio mundi* |
| *De Plant.* | *De Plantatione* |
| *Leg. Spec.* | *De Specialibus Legibus* |
| *Mut. Nom.* | *De Mutatione Nominum* |
| *Post. Cain.* | *De Posteritate Caini* |
| *Quaest. in Gen.* | *Quaestiones et Solutiones in Genesin* |
| *Pist. Soph.* | *Pistis Sophia* |
| Plato | Plato |
| *Crat.* | *Cratylus* |
| *Gorg.* | *Gorgias* |
| *Parm.* | *Parmenides* |
| *Rep.* | *Republic* |
| *Theat.* | *Theatetus* |
| *Tim.* | *Timaeus* |
| Plotinus | Plotinus |
| *Enn.* | *Enneads* |
| Plutarch | Plutarch of Chaeronea |
| *Num.* | *Vita Numae* |
| Porphyry | Porphyry |
| *Ad Marc.* | *Ad Marcellam* |
| *De abst.* | *De abstinentia* |
| *De philos. ex or. haur.* | *De philosophia ex oraculis haurienda*, ed. G. Wolff (1962) |
| *De regressu an.* | *De regressu animae* in *Vie de Porphyre*, J. Bidez (1964) |
| *De vita Plot.* | *De Vita Plotini* |
| *Sent.* | *Sententiae ad Intelligibilia Ducentes* |
| Proclus | Proclus |
| *De prov.* | *Tria Opuscula* (*De Providentia*, *Libertate*, *Malo*) |
| *El. Th.* | *The Elements of Theology* |
| *Exc. chald.* | *Excerpta Chaldaica Vaticana* |
| *In Alc.* | *In Platonis Alcibiadem Priorem Commentarii* |
| *In Crat.* | *In Platonis Cratylum Commentaria* |
| *In Parm.* | *Commentarium in Platonis Parmenidem* |
| *In Parm.* VII | *Commentarium in Parmenidem Platonis V-VII*, ed. C. Steel, vol. 2 (1985) = *Commentarium in Parmenidem: pars ultima adhuc inedita*, Plato Latinus, vol. III, eds. R. Klibansky and C. Labowsky (1953) |
| *In rem p.* | *In Platonis Rem Publicam Commentarii* |
| *In Tim.* | *In Platonis Timaeum Commentarii* |
| *Th. pl.* | *Theologica platonica* |
| *Pr. Paul* | *The Prayer of Paul* (NHC I,*1*) |
| Psellus | Michel Psellus |
| *De aur. cat.* | *De aurea catena* |
| *De oper. daem.* | *De operatione daemonum* |
| *Hypotyp.* | *Hypotyposis* |
| *PW* | *Pauly-Wissowa, Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Alterthumswissenschaft* |
| *REA* | *Revue des Études Augustiniennes* |
| *Rediscovery* | *The Rediscovery of Gnosticism*, I: *The School of Valentinus* (1980); II: *Sethian Gnosticism* (1981); ed. B. Layton |
| *REG* | *Revue des Études Grecques* |

| | |
|---|---|
| *RHR* | *Revue de l'Histoire des Religions* |
| Rist, "Mysticism" | J. Rist, "Mysticism and Transcendence in Later Neoplatonism" (*Hermes*, 92, 1964) |
| *RPFE* | *Revue Philosophie de la France et de l'Étranger* |
| *RPh* | *Revue de Philologie* |
| *RPhH* | *Revue Belge de Philologie et d'Histoire* |
| *RSR* | *Recherches de Science Religieuse* |
| Saffrey-Westerink | H. D. Saffrey and L. G. Westerink, eds., *Proclus: Theologie Platonicienne*, 4 vols. (1968-1981) |
| Schol. Arr. *Epict.* | Scholia *Epicteti Dissertationes Ab Arriani Digestae* |
| Schol. *paris. gr.* 1853 | Scholia *Parisinus graecus* 1853 |
| *SIFC* | *Studi Italiani de Filologia Classica* |
| Simplicius | Simplicius |
| *In phys.* | *In Aristotelis Physicorum Libros Quattuor Priores Commentarii* |
| Smith, *Porphyry's Place* | Andrew Smith, *Porphyry's Place in the Neoplatonic Tradition* (1974) |
| Sophocles | Sophocles |
| *OC* | *Oedipus Coloneus* |
| *Steles Seth* | *The Three Steles of Seth* (NHC VII,*5*) |
| *Symb. Os.* | *Symbolae Osloenses* |
| Synesius | Synesius of Cyrene |
| *De insomn.* | *De insomniis* |
| *H.* | *Hymni* |
| Tardieu, "Oracles Chaldaïques" | M. Tardieu, "La Gnose Valentinienne et les Oracles Chaldaïques" in *Rediscovery*, I (1980) |
| Theiler | W. Theiler, "Die Chaldäischen Orakel und die Hymnen des Synesios" in *Schriften der Königsberger Gelehrten Gesellschaft* (1942); rpt. in *Forschungen zum Neuplatonismus* (1966) |
| Theodoretus | Theodoretus of Cyrrhus |
| *Gr. aff. cur.* | *Graecarum affectionum cura* |
| *Theos.* | *Tübingen Theosophia* |
| *Treat. Res.* | *The Treatise on the Resurrection* (NHC I,*4*) |
| *Trim. Prot.* | *Trimorphic Protennoia* (NHC XIII,*1*) |
| *Tri. Trac.* | *The Tripartite Tractate* (NHC I,*5*) |
| *Val. Exp.* | *A Valentinian Exposition* (NHC XI,*2*) |
| Westerink, *Greek Comm.* | L. G. Westerink, ed., *The Greek Commentaries on Plato's Phaedo*, I: *Olympiodorus* (1976); II: *Damascius* (1977) |
| *Zost.* | *Zostrianos* (NHC VIII,*1*) |

# INTRODUCTION

The *Chaldean Oracles* are a collection of abstruse, hexameter verses purported to have been "handed down by the gods" (θεοπαράδοτα) to a certain Julian the Chaldean and/or his son, Julian the Theurgist, who flourished during the late second century C.E. Although the term "Chaldean" is generally understood in a metaphoric sense to designate Julian's "spiritual" affinity with the wisdom of the East, it has also been argued that Chaldea was the actual homeland of Julian *pater*, who may have migrated to Rome following Trajan's military campaigns in the East.[1] Another possibility recently suggested by H.-D. Saffrey is that the *Juliani* may have been of Syrian origin.[2] This suggestion is supported in part by the occurrence of the names "Ad" and "Adad" (the latter a corruption of the Syrian Hadad) in Chaldean material preserved by Proclus (see esp. notes to fr. 169). In addition, the striking parallels between several of the fragments of the *Oracles* and fragments of Numenius (who was both a contemporary of Julian *fils* as well as a native of Apamea in Syria) point in the same direction.

Saffrey would also understand the term "Chaldean" in a metaphoric sense, but with the specific meaning of one who is adept in magic (an association regularly made in Antiquity). Thus the citation in the *Suda* (no. 433) that Julian *pater* was both Χαλδαῖος and φιλόσοφος would mean that he was both a practitioner of magic as well as a speculative thinker (and not, e.g., a philosopher from Chaldea).[3] However, it was Julian *fils* (or Julian the Theurgist; see *Suda*, no. 434) who was the actual "author" of the *Oracles* (λόγια δ' ἐπῶν) as well as the writer of works on θεουργικά and τελεστικά. (The later Neoplatonists also attest to other prose works of Julian *fils*; e.g., several books on the Celestial Zones—see Proclus, *In Tim.*, III, 27, 10. According to the *Suda* entry, Julian *pater* wrote only

---

[1] This was the opinion, e.g., of J. Bidez, *La Vie de l'Empereur Julien* (Paris, 1930), p. 75; F. Cumont, *La Théologie Solaire du Paganisme Romain* (Paris, 1909), p. 476. H. Lewy, *Chaldean Oracles and Theurgy* (Cairo, 1956[1]; Paris, 1978[2]), p. 428, opts for a more general "Oriental origin."

[2] See H.-D. Saffrey, "Les Néoplatoniciens et les Oracles Chaldaïques," *REA*, XXVI, 1981, p. 225.

[3] See Saffrey, p. 216. Saffrey also notes here (following the suggestion of F. Cremer, *Die Chaldäischen Orakel und Jamblich de Mysteriis*, Meisenheim am Glan, 1969, p. 132, n. 224) that the expression *vir in Chaldea bonus* (as cited in Porphyry, *De regressu animae*, p. 29*,16, Bidez) should be similarly understood as designating "a man worthy with respect to the Chaldean rites" and not (in the usual translation) as "a man of worth from Chaldea." (In this latter sense, see Lewy, p. 286 and n. 106, who identifies this unnamed man as Julian the Chaldean.)

four books περὶ δαιμόνων.) But Julian *fils*, like his father, was also a practitioner of magic or, more precisely, "theurgy" (and thus his surname "the Theurgist"). Indeed, as Saffrey notes, it may well be that the *Oracles* themselves were transmitted via the theurgic technique of "calling" and "receiving" (see discussion *infra*), with Julian the Theurgist functioning as the "medium" through whom Julian the Chaldean extracted oracles from Plato's "soul."[4] (The crucial evidence here is a passage from Psellus. See esp. notes to frr. 84 and 138.) Saffrey would further distinguish between these Platonizing or "philosophical" oracles and those he would label as "theurgy proper;" i.e., the so-called "magical" oracles comprised of "older" material perhaps assembled or collected by Julian the Chaldean.[5] Although the *Oracles* (in whole or part) may well have been "received" via mediumistic trance (other scholars would label the *Oracles* "forgeries"),[6] a clear and precise distinction between "philosophical" and "theurgical" fragments is problematic (see further below).

Whatever the mode of transmission, of singular importance is the fact that the *Oracles* were regarded by the later Neoplatonists—from Porphyry (c. 232-303 C.E.) to Damascius (c. 462-537 C.E.)—as authoritative revelatory literature equal in importance only to Plato's *Timaeus*.[7] (Cumont, I believe, was the first to refer to them as the "Bible of the Neoplatonists".)[8] Unfortunately, what remain of the *Oracles* are only

[4] Saffrey, p. 219.

[5] Saffrey, pp. 219-220.

[6] This is the opinion, e.g., of P. Merlan, "Religion and Philosophy from Plato's *Phaedo* to the Chaldean Oracles," *JHPh*, I, 1963, p. 174. E. R. Dodds also admits this possibility, but adds: "...their diction is so bizarre and bombastic, their thought so obscure and incoherent, as to suggest the trance utterances of modern 'spirit guides' than the deliberate efforts of a forger." (See "Theurgy and its Relationship to Neoplatonism," *JRS*, 37, 1947, p. 56 = *The Greeks and the Irrational*, Boston, 1957, p. 284.) Dodds, then, like Saffrey, suggests mediumship as the "source" of the *Oracles* but, unlike Saffrey, assigns Julian *fils* only the role of recording these utterances (and not that of actual medium). But the true authorship of the *Oracles* must remain in doubt. Although a collaboration between father and son (as Saffrey suggests) is an attractive solution (see, also, Lewy, p. 5 and Exc. I, pp. 443-447, who suggests the same possibility, especially as a way of accounting for the indiscriminate use of the terms οἱ θεουργοί and οἱ Χαλδαῖοι by the later Neoplatonists when quoting the *Oracles*), nevertheless, the possibility of single authorship cannot be absolutely ruled out. In this regard, see the remarks of P. Hadot, "Bilan et perspectives sur les Oracles Chaldaïques," Lewy$^2$, pp. 703-706, who delineates all the problems but with no hard and fast conclusions. Similarly É. Des Places, *Oracles Chaldaïques* (Paris, 1971), p. 7, thinks it best, in the last analysis, to "protect the anonymity of the Oracles."

[7] See Dodds, "Theurgy," 1947, pp. 57-60 = 1957, pp. 285-289.

[8] See F. Cumont, *Oriental Religions in Roman Paganism* (London, 1911; rpt. New York, 1956), p. 279, n. 66. Cf. W. Theiler, "Die Chaldäischen Orakel und die Hymnen des Synesios," *Schriften der Königsberger Gelehrten Gesellschaft*, 18, 1942, p. 1 = *Forschungen zum Neuplatonismus* (Berlin, 1966), p. 252: "...für die späteren Neuplatoniker die dem Orient

fragments, quoted for the most part by the various Neoplatonists, although Chaldean notions are also found in the writings of such Platonizing Christians as Arnobius of Sicca (c. 253-327 C.E.), Marius Victorinus (c. 280-363 C.E.), and Synesius of Cyrene (c. 370-413 C.E.). The Byzantine philosopher, Michael Psellus (c. 1019-1078 C.E.) also wrote several commentaries on the *Oracles*, inspired by Proclus. Fortunately, much of Psellus' work is extant, providing us with an important interpretive model albeit often Christianized. The extensive commentaries of Porphyry, Iamblichus, and Proclus, however, are lost. But from the fragments we do have, we can securely locate the *Oracles* in a Middle Platonic milieu, especially that type of Middle Platonism which had affinities with both Gnosticism[9] and Hermeticism[10] as well as links with Numenius.[11] John Dillon has aptly labelled this congruence of Gnostic, Hermetic, and Chaldean thought as the "underworld of Platonism,"[12]

---

entstammende Bibel;" M. P. Nilsson, *Geschichte der Griechischen Religion*, II (München, 1961), p. 479: "die Bibel der Neuplatoniker;" Dodds, "New Light on the 'Chaldean Oracles,'" *HTR*, 54, 1961, p. 263 = Lewy$^2$, p. 693: "...the last important Sacred Book of pagan antiquity."

[9] G. Kroll, *De Oraculis Chaldaicis* (Breslau, 1894; rpt. Hildesheim, 1962), p. 70, referred to the *Oracles* as a form of "pagan gnosis." Recently, M. Tardieu has reaffirmed Kroll's position ("...the system of the Oracles is incomprehensible unless we see at its foundation the development of the Gnostic systems around Valentinus") while, at the same time, refusing to characterize the *Oracles* with the term "gnosis." (See "La Gnose Valentinienne et les Oracles Chaldaïques," in *The Rediscovery of Gnosticism*, I, ed. B. Layton, Leiden, 1980, pp. 194-237.) Tardieu's study is a structural analysis focusing on five propositions which locate the *Oracles* and Valentinianism in a shared physics, albeit religiously appropriated. But Tardieu's claim that the *Oracles* were dependent on this type of Gnosticism is overstated. The striking parallels between aspects of the *Oracles* and, e.g., "Sethian" Gnosticism (see *infra*) would preclude such a conclusion. A better solution, then, is that of Lewy who, although noting (but unsystematically) numerous parallels between the *Oracles* and Valentinianism, opts for a common Middle Platonic milieu (see pp. 311-398). In this regard, cf. J. Dillon, *The Middle Platonists* (London, 1977), pp. 384-389.

[10] At one time, Bousset (*Göttingische Gelehrte Anzeigen*, 1914, p. 713; cited by Lewy, p. 320, n. 27) had suggested that the Chaldean system was dependent on Hermetic thought; however, again, a mutual dependence on a common milieu best accounts for similarities between the two. And so, Dillon, pp. 389-392; Nock-Festugière, *Corpus Hermeticum*, I (Paris, 1972), p. VII.

[11] The parallels here, in certain instances, are so similar that some form of direct dependency is surely involved. See, e.g., Num. fr. 17 (Des Places) and *Ch. Or.*, fr. 7; Num. fr. 15 (Des Places) and *Ch. Or.*, fr. 8. (See, also, A.-J. Festugière, *La Révélation d'Hermès Trismégiste*, III, Paris, 1953, pp. 52-59 for additional parallels.) But in what direction? Festugière, "La Religion grecque à l'Époque Romaine," *REG*, 64, 1951, p. 482 and J.H. Waszink, "Porphyrios und Numenius," *Entretiens Hardt*, XII, 1965, pp. 43-44, argue for the priority of Numenius; Dodds, "Numenius and Ammonius," *Entretiens Hardt*, V, 1960, pp. 10-11 and Des Places, *Numenius* (Paris, 1973), p. 17, argue for the *Oracles*. Lewy, pp. 321-322 and Dillon, p. 364, would not, however, rule out the possibility of a common source. My own guess is that Numenius was posterior, but with the caveat that he borrowed selectively from the *Oracles*, as the differences in the two systems are often as striking as the similarities. See further comments in notes to fr. 7.

[12] Dillon, p. 384.

an expression which nicely captures the rather murky quality of these various systems with a) their elaborate and often exasperating metaphysical constructions; b) an extreme derogation of material existence; c) a dualistic understanding of human nature that envisions the soul or mind as a "spark" of the Divine trapped in matter; d) a method of salvation or enlightenment that generally involves a spiritual and/or ritual ascent of the soul; e) a mythologizing tendency that hypostasizes various abstractions into quasi-mythical beings. This movement away from the school traditions of Platonism towards an unabashed religiosity is the hallmark of these systems, although all three retain a veneer of philosophical respectability by assimilating elements from the eclectic Platonism of the day. For example, the Highest God in all three systems is often described in Pythagorean terms as a "Monad" who either exists alongside of or extends into a "Dyad" (see frr. 8, 11, 12 and notes). However, in the "underworld" of Platonism, abstract philosophical speculation gives way at this point to mythic formulations and a complex proliferation of cosmic entities is introduced,[13] with a dominant female principle, in each case, operating at all levels and directly responsible for material creation as we know it. In certain Gnostic systems, for example, she is Ennoia or Sophia; in the Chaldean system, Dynamis or Hecate; in the Hermetica (esp. *C.H.* I), Life or Nature. Despite the abstract quality of most of these names, a definite personal function is assigned to each: the Gnostic Sophia experiences feelings of grief and fear, she gives birth to the Demiurge, Ialdabaoth; the Chaldean Hecate generates life from her right hip; the Hermetic Nature entices and unites with the primal Anthropos.

This female principle ultimately reflects the World Soul of Plato's *Timaeus*, refracted in varying degrees through the prism of Middle Platonism; along the way, Plutarch will have assimilated this figure to the Egyptian Isis; Philo, to the Jewish figure of Wisdom; and Numenius will have split it into opposed good and evil entities. But it is only in the "underworld" of Platonism that philosophical speculation about this figure becomes part of revelatory myth, often to the extent that "knowing" the myth becomes an important condition of salvation (this is especially true of the Gnostic systems). In other words, knowledge for its

[13] It should be noted here that the proliferation of entities in *C.H.* I (*Poimandres*) is less "fantastic" than either that of the *Oracles* or the various Gnostic systems. Although C. H. Dodd, at one time, had suggested that the Poimandres myth was a precursor of the system associated with Valentinus ("...the Valentinian system, apart from its definitely Christian elements, has the aspect of an elaboration of a system very like that of the Poimandres;" see *The Bible and the Greeks*, London, 1954, p. 208), any direct borrowing should be ruled out in favor of a mutual stream of influence.

own sake passes over to "gnosis" for the sake of *soteria*, with spiritual enlightenment often coupled with magic and ritual as a means of freeing the soul. Although there is an ongoing debate as to what types of rituals may have been practiced in the various Gnostic and Hermetic communities (and, indeed, to what extent such communities even existed),[14] it is clear that the Chaldean system included a complex ascent ritual involving purifications, trance, phantasmagoria, sacred objects, magical instruments and formulas, prayers, hymns, and even a contemplative element, all of which was practiced (most likely) in the context of a "mystery community."[15] These and other issues are discussed in detail in the following outline.

## I. Theology

### *A. First Principles*

Chaldean theology largely reflects its Middle Platonic origins, with a stress in particular on the transcendence of the Highest God. In certain fragments, this transcendence approaches a *via negativa*, with the Highest God described as "snatched away" (fr. 3) or "existing outside" his products (fr. 84). In other fragments, however, the Highest God is positively characterized as "Father" (frr. 7, 14), "First" or "Paternal Intellect" (frr. 7, 39, 49, 108, 109), "Monad" (frr. 11, 26, 27), "Source" (frr. 13, 30, 37), and, perhaps, even "One" (frr. 9, 9a). This vacillation between negating and affirming the Highest God is a common feature of Middle Platonism, a thoroughgoing transcendence in these matters achieved principally by Plotinus, whose "One" is not only beyond Intellect, but

[14] On the role of cult and ritual in Hermeticism, see, now, J.-P. Mahé, *Hermès en Haute-Égypte*, I, (Quebec, 1978), pp. 54-59; L. Keizer, *The Eighth Reveals the Ninth: A New Hermetic Initiation Disclosure* (Seaside, CA, 1974), pp. 6-15; W. C. Grese, *Corpus Hermeticum XIII and Early Christian Literature* (Leiden, 1979), pp. 40-43; 201-202; G. Fowden, *The Egyptian Hermes*, (Cambridge, 1987), *passim*. Other scholars, however, have argued against a cultic and/or ritual Hermeticism, suggesting instead only the existence of a literary phenomenon, with the texts read, perhaps, in the context of a "school" setting. See, e.g., Festugière, *Rév.*, I, p. 84; W. Scott, *Hermetica*, I (Oxford, 1936; rpt. 1968), pp. 1-8. It should be no surprise, then, that the current debate among scholars on the problem of "Sethian" Gnosticism echoes this same division. See, e.g., F. Wisse, "Stalking those Elusive Sethians," *Rediscovery*, II, pp. 564-577, who favors the "literary phenomenon" approach, arguing that there was no Sethian community as such, but only "like-minded Gnostics" reading various texts for the purpose of individual edification. In contrast, H. M. Schenke, "The Phenomenon of Gnostic Sethianism," *Rediscovery*, II, pp. 588-616, not only posits the existence of a Sethian community or sect, but argues that the group was organized around a relatively coherent system of doctrine and cultic/ritual practice. A middle position between these extremes is now suggested by G. Stroumsa, *Another Seed: Studies in Gnostic Mythology*, (Leiden, 1984), e.g., pp. 4-8; 172 and *passim*.

[15] See Lewy, p. 177 ff.; Bidez, "Note sur les Mystères Néoplatoniciens," *RPhH*, 7, 1928, pp. 1477-1481; *La Vie Julien*, pp. 73-81.

beyond Being as well.[16] In contrast, the Chaldean Supreme God is best characterized as Nous, albeit a self-contemplating Nous akin to Numenius' First God (see fr. 8 and notes). But even here the *Oracles* vacillate: is the Father to be equated strictly with his Intellect or is the so-called Paternal Intellect to be regarded as the first emanation of the Father? And if so, of what substance then is the Father, if not intelligible? The fragmentary nature of the evidence does not permit any hard and fast conclusions on these matters; indeed, the *Oracles* elsewhere also designate the Father "Abyss" (a term especially familiar to the Gnostic sources; see fr. 18 and notes), as well as describing him in Stoic terms as essentially "fiery" in nature (see frr. 3 and 37), albeit totally transcendent. (Unlike the Stoic God, the Chaldean Father is in no sense immanent in the world.) Further, the later Neoplatonists also designated him ὕπαρξις, a notion which most likely derived from the *Oracles*, although only the verbal form ὑπάρχειν is found in the extant fragments (see frr. 1, 20, 84 and notes). In addition, the later Neoplatonists vacillated on the matter of his ontological status: Porphyry, for example, sometimes equated the Chaldean Father with the Plotinian One; Proclus, on the other hand, situated him beneath the One at the first level of the intelligible order (see fr. 3 and notes). In the last analysis, what can be affirmed about the Chaldean Supreme God is the fact of his transcendence, but not the precise nature of it.

In addition to this First God or Father (whose sole function is to "think" the Platonic world of Ideas; see frr. 37, 39, 40), there is a Second God or Demiurgic Intellect whose function is to fashion the intelligible (or Empyrean) world on the model of these Ideas (e.g., frr. 5, 33, 37). This Second Intellect is conceived of as dyadic in nature (see frr. 8 and 12) as he is turned both towards the intelligible and sensible realms (in the manner of Numenius' Second God). In this regard, the Chaldean Second God is described as "Twice Transcendent" (δὶς ἐπέκεινα ) whereas the First God is simply "Once Transcendent" (ἅπαξ ἐπέκεινα; see fr. 169 and notes). These designations also underscore the notion that the Highest God (or "Once Transcendent") exists as an indivisible unity, whereas the Second God (or "Twice Transcendent") begins the process of division which ultimately leads to creation and generation. In the *Oracles*, this process of division is described in dynamic terms; the Second Intellect (as Demiurge) is said to project the Platonic Ideas ("divisions" or "lightning-bolts") onto primal matter (or "wombs" of the World Soul) like Zeus hurling his thunderbolts (see esp. frr. 35 and 37). By this "action," the initial movement towards material creation begins.

[16] See, e.g., Dodds, "The *Parmenides* of Plato and the Origin of the Neoplatonic One," *CQ*, 22, 1928, pp. 129-142.

But this process entails the existence of a Third God, a feminine, generative entity, described either as "Power" (δύναμις) and situated as a median figure between the First and Second Gods (e.g., fr. 4), or conflated with Hecate as the World Soul (e.g., frr. 6, 51-53, 56) and thus located (in traditional Platonic fashion) on the borders between the intelligible and sensible realms. In this last regard, Hecate is described either as a "girdling membrane" (fr. 6) through whom influences travel from one level of reality to another, or is depicted in anthropomorphic terms as a goddess-like figure from whose right hip the particular souls of generation are said to issue (fr. 51).

The ambiguous localization of this feminine principle reflects an obvious truth: that a feminine element is necessary if there is to be a process of generation at all, whether at the highest or lowest levels. The figures of Ennoia and Sophia function in a similar manner in Valentinian Gnosticism. Indeed, the linking of "Power" with the Chaldean "Father" (or "Abyss") suggests a primordial bisexual deity akin to the Gnostic Abyss-Ennoia or Abyss-Sigē (see fr. 4 and notes). Sigē or "silence" is also mentioned in the *Oracles*, but seemingly not as a fully hypostatized entity (see fr. 16 and notes). A bisexual First God is also a feature of *C.H.* I—all these systems, then, underscoring the notion of an androgynous primogenitor who is the ultimate source of material creation, however dimly or darkly that creation is subsequently viewed.

Further, in the Chaldean system, the Father (or First Intellect), Power, and (Demiurgic) Intellect are regarded triadically; the Supreme God, *in fine*, understood as a triadic-monad or three-in-one deity (see frr. 26 and 27) whose Power and Intellect constitute, as it were, his immediate "faculties." A "triple-powered" Monad is also a familiar figure in various Gnostic systems, sometimes understood as the Supreme God (e.g., *Allogenes*, NHC XI, 49,36-38), other times as a lesser being (e.g., *Steles Seth*, NHC VII, 121,32-34). Of particular importance is the occurrence of the term τριδύναμος (or τριδύναμις) in several Gnostic texts (e.g., Cod. Bruce *Untitled*, 3.15; 8.12; the Coptic equivalent would be ⲡⲁ ⲧⲱⲁⲙⲧⲉ ⲛ̄ⲟⲁⲙ and variants; see, e.g., *Marsanes*, NHC X, 6,19) and the similar τριγλώχις and τριοῦχον in the *Oracles* (as descriptive of the Monad; see frr. 2, 26 and notes. Synesius, who is dependent on the *Oracles*, prefers the term τριχόρυμβον; see *H.* 9(1),66. Cf., also, our fr. 27: παντὶ γὰρ ἐν κόσμῳ λάμπει τριάς, ἧς μονὰς ἄρχει.) In addition, in the Gnostic systems, this triple-powered One or Monad is said to be constituted of e.g., Existence (τὸ ὄν, ὕπαρξις = ⲡⲏ ⲉⲧⲉ ⲡⲁⲓ̈ ⲡⲉ), Life (ζωή = ⲱⲛϩ), Thought (νόησις = ⲧⲙⲛ̄ⲧⲉⲓⲙⲉ; see *Allogenes*, NHC XI, 49,26-31) or Existence (ὕπαρξις), Life (ζωή = ⲱⲛϩ), and Intellect (νοῦς; see *Steles Seth*, NHC VII, 125,28-31), formulas which parallel the

Neoplatonic triad Existence (ὕπαρξις), Power/Life (δύναμις/ζωή), Intellect (νοῦς). This Neoplatonic triad, in turn, reflects a conflation of the Chaldean πατήρ/ὕπαρξις, δύναμις, νοῦς with the Plotinian formula of Being (τὸ ὄν), Life (ζωή), Intellect (νοῦς). (See fr. 4 and notes and cf. Proclus, *El. Th.*, props. 101-103.)

Of further interest is the occurrence of the term τριδύναμος in the writings of Marius Victorinus as descriptive of the Christian God (e.g., *Adv. Ar.* IV.21.26). As such, the Christian Trinity is viewed by Victorinus as consisting of Father (or Being), Son (or Intellect), and a median, Holy Spirit (or Life) who is feminine in nature. Victorinus also refers to the "Spirit" as *mater* (*Adv. Ar.* I.58.12) and *conexio* (*H.* III.242). A similar unorthodox understanding of the Christian Trinity is found in the *Hymns* of Synesius who, like Victorinus, views the "Spirit" (or πνοιά, not πνεῦμα; see, e.g., *H.* 2(4),98) as a median, feminine entity, variously termed ὠδίς (*H.* 1(3), 238), μάτηρ (*H.* 2(4), 101), and θυγάτηρ (*H.* 2(4), 103). Although this generative, feminine "Spirit" (for both Synesius and Victorinus) is patterned on the Chaldean δύναμις (as mediated through Porphyry),[17] the occurrence of similar triads in various Gnostic sources (e.g. Father, Mother/Spirit, Son; see, e.g., *Ap. John*, NHC II, 2,14) reflects an important interchange between the school traditions of Platonism and the Platonic "underworld."[18]

### *B. Lesser Beings*

In the Chaldean system, a complex "chain" of lesser beings fills the spaces between the Primordial Triad[19] and the world of matter. In the

[17] See P. Hadot, *Marius Victorinus, Traités Théologiques sur la Trinité*, II (Paris, 1960), pp. 868; 874-875; *Porphyre et Victorinus*, I (Paris, 1968), pp. 455-474. Augustine, however (although influenced by Victorinus), clearly rejected (or misunderstood) this trinitarian scheme at the ontological level. See *De civ. dei*, X.23: "Dicit (sc. Porphyry) enim deum patrem et deum filium quem Graece appellat paternum intellectum vel paternam mentem; de Spiritu autem sancto aut nihil aut non apert aliquid dicit; quamvis quem alium dicat horum medium, non intellego. Si enim tertiam, sicut Plotinus, ubi de tribus principalibus substantiis disputat, animae naturam etiam iste vellet intellegi, non utique diceret horum medium, id est patris et filii medium. Postponit quippe Plotinus animae naturam paterno intellectui; iste autem cum dicit medium, non postponit, sed interponit." However, Augustine's psychological trinity of *mens, amor, notitia* (in the view of Theiler and Hadot) may have been influenced by Chaldean notions (see notes to fr. 44).

[18] For further discussion, see J. M. Robinson, "The Three Steles of Seth and the Gnostics of Plotinus," *Proceedings of the International Colloquium on Gnosticism*, Stockholm, Aug. 20-25, 1973 (Stockholm, 1977), pp. 132-142; B. Pearson, "The Tractate Marsanes (NHC X) and the Platonic Tradition," in *Gnosis, Festschrift für Hans Jonas* (Göttingen, 1978), pp. 373-384; *idem*, "Gnosticism as Platonism: With Special Reference to Marsanes (NHC 10,1)," *HTR*, 77, 1984, pp. 55-72; J. Turner, "Sethian Gnosticism: A Literary History," in *Nag Hammadi, Gnosticism, and Early Christianity*, ed. by C. W. Hedrick and R. Hodgson, Jr., (Peabody, MA, 1986), esp. pp. 79-86.

[19] Lydus, *De mens.*, IV, 122; p. 159, 5-8 W., suggests a divine Ennead as well, but the evidence is inconclusive. See Hadot, *Porphyre*, I, p. 262, n. 1.

extant fragments, the most important of these are the Iynges (ἴυγγες), Connectors (συνοχεῖς), Teletarchs (τελετάρχαι), angels, and demons, although other entities are named by various commentators (see, e.g., Psellus, *Hypotyposis*). A similar "filling up" of divine space is also an important feature of Gnosticism and Hermeticism as well, where numerous quasi-mythic/quasi-abstract entities serve to separate the Highest God from the contamination of material existence.[20] In the Chaldean system, these various entities, for the most part, apparently function as diverse aspects of the world of Ideas.

### *1. Iynges*

The name ἴυγξ, in Greek literature, is particularly associated with magic. Originally it designated a certain bird, the "wryneck," which was bound to a wheel by a sorcerer and spun around as a means of attracting an unfaithful lover. In some instances, the wheel itself was called a Iynx. As such, the Iynx functioned as a love charm. Later, under the influence of Plato's spiritualization of Eros, the word Iynx came to mean the "binding" force between man and the gods.[21] It is this definition we find in the *Oracles*, but under various guises. For example, in fr. 77, the Iynges are identified with the "thoughts" ( = Ideas) of the Father; in fr. 78, they are said to be "couriers" between the Father and matter; in fr. 79, the Iynges are connected with certain cosmic entities called "Intellectual Supports;" in fr. 206, they are equated with the "magic wheels" used in the theurgic rites. The apparent confusion of function here is somewhat illusory as the Iynges, in each instance, function as mediating or "binding" entities between the intelligible and sensible worlds. Indeed, the Iynges can be viewed not only as the mediators of messages, but as the message itself.

For example, as the "thoughts" or Ideas of the Father, the Iynges are actually magical names (*voces mysticae*) sent forth by the Father as "couriers" in order to communicate with the theurgist. At this end, the magic wheel spun by the theurgist attracts these celestial Iynges and enables the theurgist (who alone is privy to the divine language of the gods) to communicate with the Father. But the message communicated by the Iynges is none other than their own magical names which, when uttered, enabled the theurgist to acquire certain divine powers.

---

[20] The paradox, of course, is that these powers not only separate but connect the various levels of the cosmos, forming a "great chain of Being."

[21] See O. Geudtner, *Die Seelenlehre der Chaldäischen Orakel* (Meisenheim am Glan, 1971), p. 42 ff.

In addition, the Iynges are connected with the Intellectual Supports, cosmic entities which play an important role in maintaining the regular movement of the planets. Such an identification undoubtedly occurred because it was believed that the Iynges—when invoked by the theurgist—became physically situated in the various planetary spheres. It was from this vantage point, then, that the Iynges mediated the message of their magical names back and forth between the two worlds.

In sum, then, the Iynges play both a cosmic and theurgic role in the Chaldean system: identified with the Platonic Ideas and Intellectual Supports they both inform and participate in ruling the Universe; identified with the magic wheels and *voces mysticae*, they aid the theurgical act. This double function is also characteristic of both the Connectors and Teletarchs, to which we now turn.

### 2. *Connectors*

As cosmic entities, the Connectors (συνοχεῖς), like the Iynges, are said to issue from the Father (who, in one instance, is actually designated First Connector; see fr. 84 and cf. frr. 32, 80, 81); however, the principal function of the Connectors is quite different. Their chief purpose is to harmonize and protect the various parts of the Universe, a notion which builds on the Stoic concept of universal "sympathy" combined with a Middle Platonic re-evaluation of Plato's Ideas. According to Lewy, this reinterpretation first occurs in Philo, where the Platonic Ideas are referred to as "invisible powers" which "hold together" the Universe.[22] In the Chaldean system, these "powers" are equivalent to the Connectors, which perform the same harmonizing function.

In addition, the Connectors are said to perform a "protective" function (see fr. 82), but the exact nature of this activity is unclear. Perhaps the Connectors "protected" or "preserved" that very harmony which they themselves had created. In other words, the Connectors not only establish the "bond" of harmony in the Universe, they also preserve this concord by felicitously watching over it as guardians.

Lastly, the Connectors, like the Iynges, also have a theurgic function, as it is on the rays of the sun (called "Material Connectors" in fr. 80) that the soul makes its initial ascent. Seemingly, this theurgic dimension is mediated through the Teletarchs (see *infra*) as the Connectors are said to "assist" these three rulers during the course of the rites. This image of the sun with its "connective" rays can also serve as a paradigm for the role of the Connectors as a whole: at the theurgic level, the "connec-

---

[22] Lewy, pp. 345-346. Cf. Philo, *De migr. Abr.* 181; *Leg. Spec.* I, 48; 329.

tive'' rays of the sun conduct the soul upward; at the cosmic level, ''connective'' currents emanate from the Father, the Primal Fire, like rays from the sun, disseminating stability and harmony throughout the Universe.

### *3. Teletarchs*

Beneath the Iynges and Connectors are located the Teletarchs (τελετάρχαι, lit. ''masters of initiation;'' see frr. 85 and 86), divine entities which are assimilated to the κοσμαγοί as rulers of the three worlds of Chaldean cosmology. As noted below, these three rulers may well parallel similar notions about various ruling powers both in Philo and the Gnostic sources. Lewy suggests an ultimate dependence here on the ''Cosmokrators'' or ''Archons'' of late Babylonian astral religion.[23] However, in contrast to the Babylonian Archons, who dominated the various planetary spheres, the Chaldean τελετάρχαι presided over the three worlds, a cosmogonic notion borrowed from the Platonic tradition.

The Teletarchs are also associated with the Chaldean virtues of Faith (πίστις), Truth (ἀλήθεια), and Love (ἔρως; see fr. 46), which function as faculties of the three rulers: Faith is connected with the Material Teletarch; Truth with the Ethereal Teletarch; Love with the Empyrean Teletarch. (A fourth virtue, ''fire-bearing Hope''—ἔλπις πυρήοχος—is also mentioned; see fr. 47.) As such, these virtues are not to be understood as spiritual qualities (as is the case with the Pauline triad of Faith, Hope, Charity),[24] but as cosmic entities involved in the very creation and maintenance of the Universe: ''For all things,'' says the oracle, ''are governed and exist in these three (virtues)'' (fr. 48). As cosmic forces, Psellus (*Hypotyp.* 11) locates these three virtues at a middle point in the Chaldean ''chain.''

In addition, Faith, Truth, and Love are also understood in a theurgic sense, as it is through these three virtues that the theurgist is said to unite with God (see fr. 48 and notes). Indeed, for Proclus, Faith is the supreme virtue, as it is Faith alone, as a ''theurgic power'' (θεουργικὴ δύναμις), which permits union with the One (see, e.g., *Th. pl.*, I.25; p. 112, 1-3, S.-W.; cf. *In Parm.* VII, p. 502, 9-12, C. Steel = p. 42, 14-16, Klibansky-Labowsky). But whether Proclus' emphasis on Faith is authentic Chaldean teaching or his own innovation remains problematic. In the extant

---

[23] Lewy, p. 423; cf. Dodds, ''New Light,'' 1961, p. 272 = Lewy$^2$, p. 701, who agrees with this interpretation.

[24] See, e.g., H. Conzelmann, *1 Corinthians: A Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians* (Philadelphia, 1975), pp. 222-223 and notes, who cites numerous parallels to this triad in various Neoplatonic, Gnostic, and Christian sources.

fragments, Eros, as both the first issue from the Father (fr. 42) and the "bond" of all things (fr. 39), is clearly the chief virtue. Although Proclus attributes his understanding of Faith to "the gods" and "the theologians" (i.e., the *Juliani*), it may well be that his emphasis on Faith (as the prime virtue) was prompted by rivalry with Christianity.[25] Whether this is the case or not (the evidence is inconclusive), Proclan Faith is not, then, the same as Christian Faith nor even traditional Platonic Faith. Christian Faith is first and foremost faith in Christ as Savior and Lord; traditional Platonic Faith is based on δόξα and conviction from sense data and, as such, is the lowest virtue. Proclan Faith, on the other hand, is a "theurgic power" which unifies the soul and unites it with God. This theurgic dimension, then, clearly links Proclus with the Chaldean tradition, as does his understanding of Faith, Truth, and Love as "purifying" virtues (see fr. 46).[26]

This last emphasis again connects these three virtues with the Teletarchs, as these three rulers are responsible for both purifying the ascending soul of material influences as well as guiding its journey upward. (As noted *supra*, it was through the medium of the Teletarchs that the rays of the sun—or "Material Connectors"—were conducted downward. It was on these rays, then, that the soul ascended, guided by the Teletarchs.) Further, all three Teletarchs have additional solar connections: the Empyrean Teletarch is associated with Aion (the transmundane sun) as the intelligible source of light; the Ethereal Teletarch is associated with Helios (the mundane sun) as the direct source of the earth's light; the Material Teletarch is associated with the moon and, as such, rules the sublunar zone traversed by the rays of the visible sun.

It should also be noted here that the Iynges, Connectors, and Teletarchs were all regarded triadically by the Neoplatonists. Not only did the three together form a triad but each, individually, was triadically conceived; i.e., three Iynges, three Connectors, three Teletarchs. In Psellus' interpretation (*Hypotyp.* 1-5), this triadization was a result of linking all three, in some way, to the three worlds. Earlier, Proclus (on whom Psellus was dependent), had already assimilated the Chaldean system to the "intellectual" and "intelligible" triads of his own system; thus, a triadic understanding of these three entities became inevitable.[27]

[25] See R.T. Wallis, *Neoplatonism* (London, 1972), p. 154 ff.

[26] For further discussion, see A. H. Armstrong "Platonic *Eros* and Christian *Agape*," *Downside Review*, 79, 1961, pp. 105-121 = *Plotinian and Christian Studies* (London, 1979), IX; W. Beierwaltes, "The Love of Beauty and the Love of God," in A. H. Armstrong, ed., *Classical Mediterranean Spirituality*, (New York, 1986), pp. 293-313.

[27] See Lewy, Exc. VII, pp. 481-485 for a convenient synopsis of the Platonic, Orphic, and Chaldean systems as found in Proclus' writings.

*4. Angels and Demons*

Angels and demons are also part of the Chaldean system and, like the Iynges, Connectors, and Teletarchs, play a role in the theurgic elevation of the soul. In the first instance, Porphyry (*De philos. ex or. haur.*, Wolff, pp. 144-145) quotes a hymn which designates three classes of ἅγιοι ἄναχτες: those who remain in the presence of the Supreme God, those who are separated from him, and those who praise him with hymns. The first and third groups can be classed together and favorably compared to the Cherubim and Seraphim of Jewish angelology.[28] As for the second group, Lewy equates these "ministering angels" (who aid the ascent of the soul) with the Iynges.[29] In addition, Psellus (*Hypotyp.* 17) distinguishes a class of "archangels" in the Chaldean "chain." Although no such angels are mentioned in the extant fragments, the notice of Psellus in *De aurea catena* (ed. Sathas, *Ann.*, IX, 1875, pp. 215-217) to the effect that Julian the Chaldean "prayed" that his son-to-be (sc. Julian the Theurgist) would receive the soul of an "archangel" suggests an authentic Chaldean origin.[30] In frr. 137 and 138, the soul of the theurgist is said to derive from the "angelic order" in general.

The *Oracles* also mention demons, specifically evil demons, the presence of which was widely accepted in the popular imagination at the time.[31] Such demons were believed to inhabit all aspects of the sublunar world and be responsible for both the passionate element in humans as well as the source of sickness and disease. The *Oracles* identify the following types: terrestrial demons (frr. 88, 90, 91, 216); atmospheric demons (frr. 91, 216); water demons (frr. 91, 92, 216); and, perhaps, lunar demons (fr. 216). In addition, these demons are described as "bestial" and "shameless" (fr. 89) and denounced as "dogs" (frr. 90, 91). This last designation is also familiar to Synesius (e.g., *H.* 1(3), 96-97; 2(4), 245-257); Proclus (*In rem p.*, II, 337, 17-18) adds that these "dogs" are "blind." Since the Chaldean tradition associated Hecate with Nature (fr. 54), it was a logical step to identify the traditional hounds of Hecate with the demons that inhabit nature. Hecate, then, became the mistress of these demons (see fr. 91 and notes).

---

[28] See Hadot, *Porphyre*, I, pp. 392-394; Lewy, pp. 9-15.

[29] Lewy, pp. 162-163.

[30] As cited by Lewy, p. 224 and n. 195; cf. Hadot, *Porphyré*, I, p. 393; Cremer, pp. 63-68.

[31] Neither Plato nor Plotinus admitted the existence of truly "evil" demons, but such a development is found both in the popular literature of the period as well as in various strands of Middle Platonism; e.g., the "underworld" of Platonism, as well as Plutarch, whose ideas about evil demons were largely dependent on Xenocrates. See Dillon, pp. 46-47; Cremer, pp. 68-86.

Of particular interest to the *Oracles* is negating the pernicious influence these demons were believed to have on the course of the theurgic rites. They had to be placated and driven off (generally by apotropaic means; see *infra*) if the *anagōgē* was to be successful. An ascetic retreat from all bodily impulses was also demanded, as demonic matter was seen to be an active, aggressive force bent on destroying man, a theme which reaches its zenith in the "underworld" of Platonism.

Good demons are also part of the Chaldean system, but are seemingly equated with the angelic order. Psellus (*Hypotyp.* 23) tells us that good demons aid the ascent of the soul (like the ministering angels described above) and help fight off attacks from evil demons. Proclus (e.g., *In rem p.*, II, 296, 7-10) makes a similar distinction. Although heroes are not mentioned in the extant fragments, Iamblichus' classification of gods, angels, demons, and heroes is most likely based on Chaldean teaching (see notes to fr. 88.)

### *5. Aion and Eros*

A word should be said here about two other divine beings which figure prominently in the Chaldean system: Aion and Eros. In the case of Aion, we immediately have the problem of deciding whether this hypostatized entity should be understood as separate from or conflated with Chronos or Time. On the face of it, the extant fragments seem to distinguish the two: cf. ἀχοιμήτου χρονοῦ, fr. 37; χρόνον ἀπέραντον, fr. 39; χρόνου χρόνος, fr. 185; and the descriptions of Aion as πατρογενὲς φάος, fr. 49 and ὅλον φῶς, fr. 59. Lewy, however, argues that all the expressions of Time in the *Oracles* should be understood as descriptive of Aion and, thus, Aion should be regarded as the "Chaldean God par excellence."[32] But Lewy's argument, in part, is based on a parallel description of Aion in what subsequent scholars (e.g., Dodds, Des Places) regard as dubious Chaldean material (e.g., *Tübingen Theosophia* 13; see further *infra*). In addition, Lewy's contention that Proclus' description of the Chaldean Chronos (see fr. 199 and notes) actually applies to Aion (arguing that Proclus had to attribute to Time those epithets the Chaldeans attributed to Aion in order to reconcile the Platonic Aion with that of the *Oracles*)[33] surely goes beyond the evidence. Lewy's tendency to over-systematize is apparent here and rightly criticized by Dodds, who would maintain a distinction between Aion and Chronos on the basis of what the fragments more obviously suggest; i.e., the existence of two separate divine be-

[32] Lewy, p. 158; cf. pp. 99-105, 401-409.
[33] Lewy, p. 104.

ings.[34] Indeed, the name "Aion" is not found in any of the extant fragments but only in the frame material (see frr. 49, 59; cf. fr. 12). Thus, following Dodds, Aion should be demoted as the principal Chaldean god (if any, it is Hecate who should receive this accolade) in favor of several Time deities, including Chronos, the ζῶναι and ἄζωνοι, and Time gods associated with Day, Night, Month, and Year (see fr. 188 and notes).

Now Aion, as described in the fragments, is regarded as "light generated from the Father" (fr. 49), "the solar world" and "whole light" (fr. 59). As such, Aion is a noetic entity identified with the transmundane sun (and thus with the Teletarch of the Empyrean World) whose principal function is to manifest the "light" (= motion) of the Father to the world of Ideas. In this capacity, Aion's role is to keep the Ideas in a state of constant circular movement, as it is through such motion that the Ideas are said to "think" (see frr. 49, 77 and notes). In effect, Aion is the hypostatized motion of an otherwise immobile Supreme God. In this regard, there is an interesting parallel in *Allogenes*, NHC XI, 60,25, where a similar "eternal, intellectual, undivided motion" subsists just below the "triple-powered" High God. Indeed, in the Gnostic material in general, the entire unfolding of the pleroma is understood as a procession of *Aeons* from the Supreme God (analogous to the "chain" of Iynges, Teletarchs, Connectors, Sources, Principles, etc. which fill up the divine spaces in the Chaldean system.) The concept of a hypostatized Eternity, of course, finds it *locus classicus* in Plato, *Tim.*, 37e ff., and is subsequently found in numerous other sources (e.g., *C.H.* XI.2-5; *Asclepius* 10; Philo, *Mut. Nom.* 267).[35]

But to what extent the Chaldean Aion should be regarded as a genuine god (with statues, temples, etc.) remains problematic. Lewy, for example, compares the Chaldean Aion to both the Iranian Zervan and the Mithraic Aion, but his comparisons here are again based on the descriptions of Aion in *Tübingen Theosophia* 13 as well as various Iranian and Mithraic sources and not on the extant fragments.[36] Although Proclus refers to Aion as an "intelligible god" (*In Tim.*, III, 13, 23) who is even greater than Nous (*ibid.*, 27, 18 ff.), he does not then describe Aion in

[34] See "New Light," p. 266 = Lewy$^2$, p. 696.

[35] For further discussion of the figure of Aion, see Festugière, *Rév.*, IV, pp. 141-199; "Le sens philosophique du mot ΑΙΩΝ," *La Parola del Passato,* XI, 1949, pp. 172-189 = *Études du Philosophie Grecque,* (Paris, 1971), pp. 254-271; A. D. Nock, "A Vision of Mandulis Aion," *HTR*, 27, 1934, pp. 79-99 = *Essays on Religion and the Ancient World*, I (Cambridge, MA, 1972), pp. 377-396; W. Bousset, "Der Gott Aion," in *Religionsgeschichtliche Studien*, (Leiden, 1979), pp. 192-230.

[36] Lewy, pp. 405-409 and notes. Nock, however, ("Aion," 1934, p. 82 = 1972, p. 382) would discount any direct equation of Aion and Zervan.

terms that would suggest a true deity (with a cult, statues, etc., as is the case with Hecate). Proclus does say, however, that the Chaldean Chronos, as a god, was invoked during the course of a theurgic rite (or αὐτοφάνεια; see *ibid.*, 20, 22-24) but he does not then (*pace* Lewy) refer to Aion in this way. The most that can be said, then, is that the *Oracles*, to some extent, conflated Aion (as a noetic entity) with the Oriental notion of a true Aionic deity, but the extent of this process remains in doubt.[37]

We find a similar problem with the Chaldean Eros (mentioned above in connection with the triad Faith, Truth, Love). In addition to this association, the *Oracles* also mention Eros independently as the "first" to "leap" from the Paternal Intellect (fr. 42). As such, Eros functions as a cosmic principle whose "binding" quality preserves a sense of harmony not only in the Universe but in the human soul as well (see frr. 43 and 44). As such, Eros functions in much the same way as the Connectors, Iynges, and Intellectual Supports; in Geudtner's analysis, these last three are all "held together" through the "binding fire" of Eros as "die ausführenden Organe des Eros."[38]

As a cosmic principle, Eros also takes on a quasi-mythological dimension; in fr. 42, he is said to "mingle" his "binding fire" with that of the Ideas in various "Source Craters," a reflection of the "mixing" metaphor in Plato, *Tim.* 41d (but here, of course, it is the Demiurge who does the "mixing"). But to what extent Eros functioned as a true god in the Chaldean system cannot be recovered from the extant material.

In any event, Eros' function as an all-pervasive cosmic power which "leaps forth" from God towards man and the world goes beyond what Wallis calls the "normal Platonic 'ascending' form" of Love[39] (as, e.g., reflected in fr. 48), but approaches, in some respects, the Christian notion of *agapē*, wherein God Himself is motivated by love. But the parallel, of course, is not exact. The *Oracles*, for example, have no figure analogous to Christ, in whom, for Christians, the love of God is most fully manifest. However, Proclus does develop the Chaldean notion of Divine Love to its fullest extent, envisioning both gods and men as moved by Eros to help those less perfect (e.g., *In Alc.*, I, 15 [33,8-16 Cr.] W.).

## II. Cosmology

The Chaldean concept of the cosmos envisions a triad of concentric circles which encompasses both the intelligible and sensible orders: the

[37] Cf. Dodds, "New Light," p. 266, n. 12 = Lewy$^2$, p. 696, n. 12: "This Chaldean Aion strikes one as an abstraction rather than a personal god."

[38] Geudtner, p. 47.

[39] Wallis, p. 154; cf. Armstrong, esp. p. 116 ff.

Empyrean World is properly that of the intelligible; the Ethereal, that of the fixed stars and planets; the Material comprises the sublunar realm including Earth. However, such a distinction is not explicitly made in the extant fragments (but cf. fr. 76 and see frr. 39, 61, 62, 67) but is based on information from the later Neoplatonists. Proclus, for example, tells us that the Chaldeans "divided" the Universe into Empyrean, Ethereal, and Material Worlds (*In Tim.*, II, 57, 10-14), as does Psellus (*Hypotyp.* 3 and 5). But Psellus elsewhere confuses the picture by conflating these three worlds with the seven planetary spheres or στερεώματα; e.g., *P.G.* 122, 1149 c 1-3 where he mentions ἑπτὰ σωματικοὺς κόσμους: 1 Empyrean, 3 Ethereal, 3 Material. Damascius, similarly, speaks of a "chain" of three στερεώματα: Empyrean, Ethereal, Material (II, 88,21-22). Although Lewy thinks this confusion originates with the later Neoplatonists (and not with the *Juliani*),[40] the lack of supporting evidence from the fragments must leave this question in doubt. Nevertheless, a basic division into three realms is clearly a Chaldean tenet, a notion which Dillon traces back to Xenocrates and, subsequently, is found elsewhere in various Middle Platonic sources (e.g., Philo, *De opif.*, 70-71; *Quaest. in Gen.*, IV.8).[41] However, Tardieu's suggestion that the more immediate background of the Chaldean doctrine is the Stoic concept of "three fires" (see notes to fr. 73) is even more persuasive, since Chaldean cosmology, as a whole, is informed by a heliocentrism in which the sun functions as the "heart" or "center" of the Universe (see frr. 58, 70, 111). In this regard, each of the three worlds can be viewed as a "fiery" circle dominated, respectively, by the transmundane sun, mundane sun, and moon, each of which, in turn, is equated with one of the three Teletarchs.

Now, the notion of planetary rulers is a familiar one, as well, in Gnosticism, where various Archons similarly hold sway over the celestial spheres. However, there is an important distinction to be made here. The Chaldean Teletarchs are benign, even helpful figures, who aid the ascent of the soul; in contrast, the Gnostic Archons are hostile figures who must be subdued if the soul's ascent is to be safe and sure. This distinction is based on a crucial difference in attitude towards matter: since most of the Gnostic systems emphasize a radical fissure between the highest and lowest regions (and, thus, are essentially dualistic), the created world *in toto*—heavenly and sublunar—is subsequently viewed in strongly negative terms. Thus creation, in the Gnostic systems (especially varieties of Valentinianism), becomes the deformed work of an ignorant

---

[40] Lewy, pp. 123, n. 218; 137, n. 270.
[41] Dillon, pp. 168-170.

(even evil) Creator, who rules the lower world (in opposition to the High God) in conjunction with his cohorts, the Archons. This rule is regarded in terms of a repressive Heimarmene (or astral determinism).

In contrast, the Chaldean system maintains a more positive, monistic view of creation;[42] since matter is regarded as πατρογενές ("Father-generated"), it is only the furthest outreach of matter (or the sublunar world) which is strongly negated. On the other hand, that region which is closest to the intelligible world, viz. the Ethereal World of fixed stars and planets, still retains a significant portion of the Father's "light." Although this realm may be "implicated in matter" (see fr. 69), it is not then *submerged* in matter as is the sublunar world. (In this regard, see frr. 134 and 163, where the Material World is regarded as "light-hating," "dark-gleaming," "foul," "illusive," etc.)

Since the hylophobia of the *Oracles* does not extend to the Ethereal World, neither does the notion of Heimarmene. In the Chaldean system, the rule of Heimarmene is equated with φύσις or Nature (see fr. 102) and thus, with those demonic powers which pervade Nature. Thus, to "escape" Heimarmene in the Chaldean system is to escape the control of sublunar demons which incite the passions (see frr. 153 and 154) and not, as in the Gnostic systems, to escape the domination of astral and/or planetary powers above the moon.[43]

In the Chaldean system, the Material World is also equated with Hades, a familiar notion of the period and perhaps, as Lewy notes, originating in the idea that the torments of the Netherworld were akin to the irrational impulses of the body.[44] (In this regard, Psellus, *P. G.* 122, 1153 a 2-3, mentions that the Chaldeans equated Hades with the irrational soul.) In any event, Hades, as synonymous with the Material World, becomes the direct antithesis of the intelligible or Empyrean World, although, in the *Oracles*, the terms βάθος and βυθός are used alike to designate both the realm of the Father as well as the world of matter (see frr. 18, 163 and notes). This "apophatic characteristic of high and low" (to borrow Tardieu's expression)[45] is also found in the *Enneads* as well as in various Gnostic sources and underscores the idea that both the highest and lowest levels, at least on the surface, are utterly simple. The crucial difference, however, is that simplicity at the highest level signifies

---

[42] This monistic emphasis is also shared with certain "Sethian" tractates from the Nag Hammadi Library (esp. *Marsanes* and *Allogenes*), both of which (in Pearson's words) have "virtually abandoned" the dualism of "more primitive forms of Gnosticism;" see "Tractate Marsanes," p. 383. Schenke makes a similar observation with regard to *Steles Seth*; see "Phenomenon," pp. 614-615.

[43] See Lewy, esp. p. 390

[44] See Lewy, p. 282, n. 90, who cites several sources.

[45] Tardieu, p. 206.

that the Supreme God is *beyond* all categories of form whereas, at the lowest level, it means that matter, as utter sterility (see frr. 100 and 134), is *devoid* of all form and, thus, needs to be *informed.* In the *Oracles*, this informing process is depicted dynamically in terms of the Second or Demiurgic Intellect hurling the Ideas (as thunderbolts) into the "wombs" of the World Soul.

In addition to this association with matter, Hades may also have been regarded as a personal god in the Chaldean system. Although the extant fragments do not mention Hades in this regard, Psellus does: he attributes to Chaldean belief the notion that Hades is the ἀρχηγὸν τῆς περιγείου λήξεως (*P.G.*, 122, 1152 d 5-6). According to Lewy, this is an "authentic Chaldean concept" which ultimately reflects notions about the evil Ahriman. As such, argues Lewy, the Chaldean Hades (like Ahriman) would then be Lord of the demons which inhabit the Material World.[46] A Prince of demons is also found in Synesius' *De Providentia* (in the figure of Typhon); Porphyry, as well, recognizes a Chief of demons (e.g., *De abst.*, II, 37-43). Both of these writers, of course, are dependent on Chaldean demonology. (Julian *pater*, as noted earlier, wrote four books περὶ δαιμόνων.) But these observations must be tempered by the fact that the extant fragments evidently assign this dubious honor to Hecate (see fr. 91 and notes). Thus, the extent to which Hecate's role in this capacity was distinguished from that of Hades cannot be known, except to acknowledge the presence of both in the Chaldean system as Ruler(s) of demons.

## III. Anthropology

Chaldean anthropology is essentially informed by a Platonic-derived body/soul dualism in which the soul is depicted as descending into matter (via the ether, sun, moon, and air—the raiments of which make up the "vehicle" of the soul; see fr. 61 and further below) to "serve" the body ("our rushing vessel;" see fr. 186) but, hopefully, with an "untamed neck" (see fr. 99). As described by Synesius, this is actually a two-fold descent in which the soul first "serves" (θητεύειν) the body, and then becomes "enslaved" (δουλεύειν) to it (see *H.* 1(3), 571 ff.; cf. *De insomn.*, 139 c). This "enslavement" or submersion into matter is also referred to as a kind of "intoxication," wherein the soul is said to be "drunk" on material distractions and thus needs to "sober up" and reflect on its divine origins and the nature of the Divine World (a familiar theme in the Platonic "underworld;" see fr. 15 and notes).

---

[46] Lewy, pp. 279-293.

The *Oracles* also distinguish two types of men: the theurgists (οἱ θεουργοί) and "the herd" (ἡ ἀγέλη). The former are those whose souls are properly purified and thus saved; the latter comprise the mass of men who plunge headlong into the whirl of passions (see frr. 153, 154 and notes). Although no further types of men are mentioned in the extant fragments, Cremer argues that the three classes of individuals outlined in Iamblichus, *De myst.*, V.18 are based on Chaldean doctrine.[47] The first group would constitute "the herd" (ἡ ἀγέλη) or those totally involved with the material world; the third group would comprise "the few" (οἱ ὀλίγοι) or those free of all material constraints (and thus equivalent to the theurgists); the second group would be made up of those in between or "the middle men" (οἱ μέσοι) who, according to Iamblichus, are midway between φύσις ( = material world) and καθαρὸς νοῦς ( = intelligible world). Although the extant fragments do not mention this middle group, Cremer points out that Iamblichus' tripartite division of men in V.18 exactly parallels a similar tripartition of gods (noeric, ethereal, hylic) in V.19. Thus, both gods and men would correspond to the Empyrean ( = noeric), Ethereal, and Material Worlds of Chaldean theology. Based on this evidence, then, it is likely that a tripartite classification of men can be assumed for the *Oracles* as well, especially given the Chaldean fondness for triadic classifications of all types.

According to the fragments, the souls of the theurgists are said to derive from the angelic order, from which point they incarnate with the purpose of aiding mankind (see frr. 122, 123, 138 and notes. The figure of Osiris in Synesius' *De Providentia* is clearly modelled on this idea.) But this descent is not simply an automatic one, but a willful choosing to reincarnate, as the theurgist has the option of remaining "forever" in the intelligible realm (fr. 138). Smith suggests that this latter idea may have influenced Porphyry, who affirmed the permanent release of the soul[48] (see *De regressu an.*, p. 41*, 22-25 Bidez), but the seed of such a notion is also apparent in Plotinus; e.g., *Enn.* II.2.4.8-11; 4.6.30 ff. However, Porphyry was most likely influenced by that Chaldean doctrine which denied reincarnation in bestial form (see fr. 160). Porphyry accepts this doctrine (see, e.g., *De regressu an.*, p. 38*, 10-15 Bidez) *contra* Plotinus, who had favored the idea of transmigration not only in animal but vegetable form as well (based on the premise that a soul which succumbs to its basest elements deserves a similar existence; see, e.g., *Enn.* III.4.2; IV.3.12.25-29). The *Oracles* happily reject this idea. Indeed, the *Oracles* apparently grant the lower soul (and its vehicle) a permanent post-

[47] Cremer, pp. 123-130.

[48] A. Smith, *Porphyry's Place in the Neoplatonic Tradition* (The Hague, 1974), pp. 55-68.

mortem dwelling place in the Ethereal World (see fr. 158 and further below); the rational soul, then, ascending to the intelligible or Empyrean World and entering "paradise" (or the choir of angels which perpetually praise the Father with hymns; see fr. 165 and notes). Unpurified souls, however, would spend a period of time in Hades, undergoing some form of retribution and/or purification until they were ready to return to Earth (see fr. 162 and notes).

## IV. Soteriology

The principle means of salvation in the Chaldean system involves the purification of the soul via the techniques of theurgy. Although the precise term θεουργία does not appear in the extant fragments, the related noun θεουργοί does (fr. 153). However, Cremer overstates his case when he declares that the *Oracles* are "der konstituierende Bestandteil der Theurgie; vor ihnen und ohne sie gibt es keine Theurgie."[49] After all, the *Suda*, s.v., reports that Julian *fils* wrote θεουργικά, τελεστικά, and λόγια δ' ἐπῶν, suggesting the existence of three separate works.[50] In this regard, Boyancé has shown that the term τελεστικά, as it refers to the art of fabricating statues, has a much wider application than Chaldean usage.[51] Thus Boyancé, *contra* Dodds, would separate τελεστικά from θεουργικά.[52] (Dodds had relegated τελεστικά to a "branch" of theurgy.[53] Smith similarly speaks of "branches" of theurgy.)[54] The problem here, of course, is whether all things Chaldean are equally theurgic (Cremer's assumption). The confusion, in part, goes back to the later Neoplatonists, who often referred to the *Juliani* collectively as οἱ θεουργοί as well as οἱ Χαλδαῖοι.[55] But this is an observation after the fact. Indeed, if it was Julian *fils* (or Julian the Theurgist) who actually coined the term θεουργία,[56] then the tradition associated with Julian *pater* (or Julian the

[49] Cremer, p. 20.

[50] Although the scholion on Lucian, *Philops.* 12; IV.224 Jacobitz (as cited by Westerink, "Proclus, Procopius, Psellus," *Mnemosyne*, 10, 1942, p. 276:...τὰ τελεστικά φησι Ἰουλιανοῦ, ἃ Πρόκλος ὑπομνηματίζει...) perhaps refers to the *Oracles* (and so Dodds, "Theurgy," 1947, p. 55 = 1957, p. 284; cf. Hadot, "Bilan et perspectives," p. 704, n. 3), I still think it prudent to keep the three titles distinct.

[51] P. Boyancé, "Théurgie et Télestique Néoplatoniciennes," *RHR*, 147, 1955, pp. 189-209.

[52] Boyancé, p. 191.

[53] Dodds, "Theurgy," 1947, p. 62 = 1957, pp. 291-292.

[54] Smith, pp. 83-141 *passim*.

[55] See *supra*, n. 6

[56] This has been the opinion of most scholars since the time of Bidez and Cumont. See, e.g., Bidez, *La Vie Julien*, p. 369, n. 8; Cumont, *Oriental Religions*, p 279, n. 68; S. Eitrem, "La Théurgie chez les Néo-Platoniciens et dans les Papyrus Magiques," *Symb. Os.*, 22, 1942, p. 49; Lewy, Exc. IV, p. 461; Dodds, "Theurgy," 1947, p. 55 = 1957, p. 283; Cremer, p. 19.

Chaldean) could not have been understood, at least initially, as a tradition of theurgy. Thus, any tradition "handed down" from father to son (including the *Oracles*) might properly be labelled "Chaldean" but not, in every respect, necessarily "theurgic." That the two terms are closely related goes without saying, but any absolute identification (as Hadot notes)[57] must remain problematic.

A further difficulty is a matter of definition: how exactly are we to define the word "theurgy?" One possibility (as suggested, e.g., by Eitrem and Dodds) is that theurgy should be understood in the sense of "working on" or even "creating" the gods, thus emphasizing the role of the theurgist as the principal agent in the theurgic *ergon*.[58] But theurgy involves more than just "working on" the gods; it also involves the active participation of the gods themselves. Theurgy, then, can best be characterized as "divine action," since theurgy properly involves not only "divine actions" on the part of men, but the "action of the Divine" on behalf of men. As A. Smith aptly puts it: "Men are involved in the operation of ritual or divine action, but it is the Divine which achieves results."[59]

Theurgy as praxis, then, can be distinguished from theology as speculation (indeed, it may be that Julian *fils* "invented" the term theurgy to distinguish his activity from that of the θεολόγοι, or those who merely "think" about the gods)[60], but how are we to distinguish theurgy from magic, which it more closely resembles? Is theurgy simply a form of "white" or "good" magic, in contrast to the "black" or "evil" magic associated with the name *goēteia*, as some scholars have suggested?[61] Yes and no. Theurgy certainly appropriates many of the techniques familiar to the magician, but its purpose is quite different: whereas "common" magic has a "profane" goal (e.g., in its "white" form, influencing a lover or affecting the weather), theurgy has a specific religious or salvific end, namely, the purification and salvation of the soul (see, e.g.,

[57] "Bilan et perspectives," p. 707.

[58] See Eitrem, "Théurgie," p. 49; Dodds, "Theurgy," 1947, p. 55, n. 11 = 1957, p. 300, n. 10.

[59] Smith, p. 100.

[60] This was originally the conjecture of Bidez, *La Vie Julien*, p. 369, n. 8; and so Lewy, Exc. IV, p. 461; Dodds, "Theurgy," 1947, p. 55 = 1957, pp. 283-284.

[61] See, e.g., A. A. Barb, "The Survival of the Magic Arts," in *The Conflict Between Paganism and Christianity in the Fourth Century*, ed. A. Momigliano (Oxford, 1963), p. 101, who quotes the words of Augustine (*De civ. dei* X.9): "quam vel magiam vel detestabiliore nomine goetiam vel honorabiliore theurgiam vocant." Cf. Eitrem, p. 76: "...il y a une proche parente entre la magie et la théurgie;" pp. 72-73: "...des communs efforts et des communs remédes des magiciens et des théurges;" Lewy, p. 238: "...the magical art of the Chaldean theurgists did not differ in essentials from that of their competitors (the 'goets')."

Iamblichus, *De myst.*, I.12: τῆς ψυχῆς σωτήριον). In addition, and most importantly, theurgy emphasizes a passive attitude towards the gods (with the gods taking the initiative), whereas magic involves coercing or forcing the gods against their will. This aspect of theurgy is especially emphasized by Iamblichus, who repeatedly stresses that the rites of theurgy (*contra goēteia*) do not involve the forcing or drawing down of the gods but, rather, entail a free and willing bestowal of Divine power by which the gods purify the devout and draw them upward (see, e.g., *De myst.*, I.12; 14; II.6; 11; III.1; 10; 18; IV.2). For Cremer, this distinction is so critical that he baldly states: "...ist eine Gleichsetzung von Theurgie und Magie nicht mehr möglich."[62] If magic is to be defined essentially as coercion,[63] then theurgy can no longer be confused with magic, as both its intent (the salvation of the soul) and effect (a passive relation with the gods) are counter to magical practice as it is commonly understood. Theurgy, therefore, should be regarded basically as a religious phenomenon, albeit one that is comfortable with the outward forms of magic.

In this regard, Trouillard compares, indeed equates, theurgy with Christian sacramentalism, emphasizing a common principle of *ex opere operato* as well as a similar notion of Divine "grace."[64] In the first instance, it is through "act" alone (e.g., gestures, signs, manipulation of objects) that the Divine reveals itself. In Iamblichus' words (*De myst.*, II.11): "The tokens (συνθήματα) themselves, by themselves, effect their own work." Secondly, the efficacy of any ritual act (theurgic or sacramental) depends not on constraint (as stressed *supra*), but on the willing, "gracious" presence of God. Based on these similarities, then, Trouillard concludes that theurgy and Christian sacramentalism are essentially the same, the only difference being that of orientation; i.e., Christian sacramentalism (especially the Eucharist, which Trouillard

---

[62] Cremer, p. 20; cf. pp. 25-36.

[63] Cf. Barb, p. 101: "The fundamental difference between magic and religion is still the same as it always was. On the one hand, we have the religious man, offering his adorations in humble supplication to the Deity; always careful to add to any supplication the reservation 'if it be according to Thy Will.' On the other hand, we have the magician, attempting to force the supernatural powers to accomplish what he desires and avert what he fears." For more recent assessments of the relation between magic and religion in Antiquity see, e. g., A. F. Segal, "Hellenistic Magic: Some Questions of Definition," in *Studies in Gnosticism and Hellenistic Religions*, ed. by R. van den Broek and M. J. Vermaseren (Leiden, 1981), pp. 349-375; D. E. Aune, "Magic in Early Christianity," *ANRW*, II.23.2, 1980, pp. 1507-1577.

[64] See J. Trouillard, "La Théurgie païenne," *Encyclopedia Universalis*, V. 15, pp. 582-583; *L'Un et l'Ame selon Proclos* (Paris, 1972), pp. 171-189. Trouillard suggestively defines theurgy as "un symbolisme opératoire destiné à éveiller la presence divine." He also emphatically states that "la théurgie n'est pas la magie."

views as the "center" of the Sacraments) "continues the history of a man-God," whereas theurgy is fixed in "mythic thought."[65] This may be so (although theurgic ritual, *pace* Trouillard, in no sense recalls the adventures of any mythic personage; on this point, Trouillard confuses theurgic ritual with that of the Mysteries), but a more important point of contrast, I think, can be found in a fundamental difference in world view. Christian sacramentalism, after all, is based on a theistic view which assumes an essential difference between Creator and creation. Thus, any sacramental act performed here below must ultimately depend for its effect on an irruption of the Divine into an otherwise natural order. In contrast, theurgy is based on an emanationist view which posits a "sympathetic" link between all aspects of the cosmos; the emphasis here is on sameness, not difference. Thus theurgy, unlike Christian sacramentalism, depends not on any inbreaking of the Divine but, rather, on a recognition of the Divine's presence in even the basest matter. (In this regard, see, e.g., Proclus, *El. Th.*, props. 144 and 145.) It is on this point, then, that theurgy and Christian sacramentalism part company.

In the following sections, the theurgical praxis associated with the Chaldean system is outlined in detail, based on information from both the extant fragments as well as relevant parallel material from other sources. Lewy's attempt to systematize this material, of course, cannot be applauded enough. However, many problems remain. Indeed, as Hadot points out, if we agree that the *Oracles* (in whole or part) were received via mediumistic trance over a period of time, then, in Hadot's words, "toutes les expressions Chaldaïques ne peuvent être totalement cohérentes, et les reconstructions systématiques doivent être menées avec la plus grande prudence."[66] Dodds is similarly cautious, while at the same time praising Lewy's attempt "to dovetail together the smallest scraps of information."[67] Such caveats apply not only to the theological constructs which inform the Chaldean system (with its awkward fusion of gods, goddesses, and philosophical hypostases), but to the actual practices which come under the rubric of theurgy.

Lewy broadly separates the latter into "magical ritual" and "theurgical elevation," with the purpose of distinguishing certain isolated rites from the *anagōgē* proper. However, this separation is somewhat arbitrary, as Lewy himself admits,[68] since no systematic presentation of Chaldean theurgic ritual is preserved in any of the relevant sources. Nonetheless, it is more than likely that Chaldean theurgic prac-

---

[65] *Enc. Univ.*, p. 583.
[66] "Bilan et perspectives," p. 719.
[67] "New Light," p. 268 = Lewy$^2$, p. 697.
[68] Lewy, pp. 227-228.

tice was close, in many respects, to those traditions preserved in the magical papyri (and reflected, as well, in various Gnostic and Hermetic rites of ascent) and, indeed, as more recent scholarship suggests, may well have included a genuine noetic/contemplative element at the highest levels of ascent. These and other issues are discussed below.

*A. Conjunction*

The term "conjunction" (σύστασις), although it appears just once in a questionable fragment (fr. 208), is familiar to us from its widespread use in the magical papyri (as Eitrem has admirably demonstrated).[69] The term refers to the "communication" or "contact" (but not "union")[70] of the theurgist (or magician) with a particular god or spirit. It was via this particular rite that Julian the Chaldean purportedly "conjoined" (συνέστησε) the soul of Julian *fils* with that of Plato and "all the gods" (see notes to fr. 84). Proclus was also adept in the art of conjunction (see fr. 208) and reports that such practices were especially used by the Chaldeans to "conjoin" with the various Time gods (e.g., Night, Day, Month, Year) as well as with Chronos himself (see *In Tim.*, III, 32, 16 ff.; 89, 15 ff.). The principal means of effecting this contact was through the use of various invocations: the adept "called upon" the god by uttering his divine names, which amounted to a lengthy recitation of unintelligible vowel and consonant sounds. Such *nomina barbara* (see fr. 150) or *voces mysticae* (equivalent to the συνθήματα and σύμβολα; see frr. 2, 108, 109 and notes) are found throughout the magical papyri as well as in certain Gnostic and Hermetic texts and are a staple of late Antique magical practice. Although a cursory glance at these lists of sounds reveals what appears to be a random selection of so much vocal gibberish, closer scrutiny shows that there are definite patterns not only to the arrangements of the vowels and consonants, but also in terms of numerical equations, all of which had potent magical properties.[71] By rhythmically

---

[69] See "Théurgie," *passim*; "Die σύστασις und der Lichtzauber in der Magie," *Symb. Os.*, 8, 1929, pp. 49-53.

[70] See Eitrem, "Die σύστασις," p. 50. Although Eitrem here rightly distinguishes the ritual of "conjunction" from the *unio mystica* of Plotinus, nonetheless, he claims elsewhere that theurgy had its origins with Plotinus: "...Plotin, dont, sans doute, dérive la théurgie" (see "Théurgie," p. 50). But this is surely wrong. See Dodds, "Theurgy," 1947, pp 57-58 = 1957, p. 286 and notes to frr. 155 and 166.

[71] See e.g., F. Dornseiff, *Das Alphabet in Mystik und Magie*, 2nd ed. (Leipzig, 1925; rpt. 1975); M. Hirschle, *Sprachphilosophie und Namenmagie im Neuplatonismus* (Meisenheim am Glan, 1979); P. C. Miller, "In Praise of Nonsense," in *Classical Mediterranean Spirituality*, pp. 481-505. Cf., also, F. Wisse, "Language Mysticism in the Nag Hammadi Texts and in Early Coptic Monasticism I: Cryptography," *Enchoria*, 9, 1979, pp. 101-109.

chanting these sounds (which equalled the "hidden" or divine name of the god), the adept was able to effect the proper conjunction with the god.

The σύστασις with a specific deity or spirit could also be effected via material means. Psellus, in a long passage (*P.G.* 122, 881 b-c), relates a Chaldean "covenant" involving the burying and digging up of certain purified "hylic" substances (e.g., spices, plants, stones) as a means of conjoining with the corresponding spirit of the plant or stone. The chief effect of this particular conjunction was to form a "compact" with the invoked spirit so that he would function as a ministering agent during the soul's ascent (and thus help ward off demonic attack).[72]

### *B. Conjuration*

Another rite involved the actual "conjuring up" of a specific deity who would then prophesy to the theurgist. This process of conjuration could seemingly proceed in one of two ways: either by animating the god's statue or by a ritual of "binding" and "loosing."

#### *1. Animation of statues*

This particular rite properly comes under the rubric of τελεστική, although (as noted above) both the term and the rite (like the term σύστασις) have a wider application than Chaldean usage. Ultimately, the art of statue vivification goes back to an Egyptian origin.[73] The actual term τελεστική, however, does not appear in the extant fragments; it is possible, then, that the later Neoplatonists derived most (but not all) of their information on the subject from the τελεστικά of Julian *fils*.[74]

According to Psellus (see Bidez, *Mélanges Cumont*, p. 95), this τελεστικὴ ἐπιστήμη involved the placing of certain stones, herbs, even small animals (all designated as σύμβολα; cf. fr. 108 and notes) within the cavity of a statue to establish a "sympathetic" relation with the god. Iamblichus (*De myst.*, V.23) makes a similar statement (although using the expression ἡ θεουργικὴ τέχνη), stressing that these "sacred" (ἱερά), "perfect" (τέλεια), and "godlike" (θεοειδῆ) objects provided a "complete and pure receptacle" (δοχὴν ὁλοτελῆ καὶ καθαράν) for the god. A comparable rite is described in fr. 224 (although this is properly a "Porphyrian," not Chaldean, oracle; see notes *ad loc.*), where Hecate gives instructions on how to fashion her "image;" in this case, from lizards and herbs "in the

[72] See Lewy, pp. 230-238.

[73] See Dodds, "Theurgy," 1947, p. 63 = 1957, p. 293.

[74] On the "telestic art" of the Chaldeans, see Lewy, Exc. X, pp. 495-496; Dodds, "Theurgy," 1947, pp. 61-65 = 1957, pp. 291-295; Boyancé, esp. pp. 191-194.

clear air under the waxing moon,'' in conjunction with a prayer (missing from the text but probably composed, in part, from *nomina barbara*; cf., e.g., *Mithras Liturgy*, p. 23 ff., Meyer).

The operative principle behind all these procedures is that of *sympatheia*, a notion which assumes a direct correspondence between a given deity and his or her symbolic representative in the animal, mineral, and vegetable worlds. Thus, by properly fashioning and consecrating the god's ''material image'' (and then placing it in the god's statue), he or she could be persuaded to appear (generally in the form of light) and answer the questions put to him by the theurgist. The ''illumination'' from the deity also aided the purification of the soul and its ''vehicle'' (see further *infra*).

### 2. *Binding and Loosing*

This rite (like that of σύστασις and τελεστική) must be largely reconstructed from sources outside the *Oracles* (including the ''Doubtful Fragments''—especially the ''Porphyrian'' oracles—of our own text). Again, it is a matter of a common magical practice appropriated by the theurgists for their own ends.

The technique itself involved the ''binding'' of a god in a human medium (again, via the utterance of *voces mysticae*) and then ''loosing'' him (via similar formulae) when the rite was completed. Fr. 141 suggests that the medium himself could effect the ''loosing'' (ἔκλυσις) of the god simply by turning his thoughts to ''earthly things.''

In any event, what is important to stress here is that it was not the theurgist, but the god invoked, who had ultimate control over the rite. Although (as Lewy notes) the Chaldeans freely used the current vocabulary of conjuration (e.g., δεσμοί, ἀνάγκη, βία; cf. Psellus, *Scripta minora* = Des Places, p. 221: (οἱ Χαλδαῖοι) δεσμοῦσι καὶ λύουσιν (sc. τοὺς θεούς) they did not then claim to have power over the gods, as the gods themselves had communicated the very spells which would bind them.[75] This point is underscored in fr. 222, where Hecate appears at the behest of an ''eloquent prayer'' which the gods had initially suggested. Porphyry uses the apt phrase ''persuasive necessity'' (πειθανάγκη; fr. 219) to convey this same sense of gentle persuasion (as opposed to the active coercion of the magician; in this regard, cf. frr. 220, 221, and 223, where the gods invoked complain about being bound ''against their will,'' an important argument for a non-Chaldean origin for these particular fragments. See notes *ad loc.*).

---

[75] Lewy, p. 58, n. 184; cf. pp. 39-47; Exc. V, pp. 467-471.

Prior to the rite, the officiants—or "caller" (κλήτωρ) and "receiver" (δοχεύς; see fr. 211 and cf. Proclus, *In Crat.*, 100, 21-22: αἱ θεουργίαι τοὺς μὲν κλήτορας καὶ τοὺς δοχέας...προκαθαίρειν παρακελεύονται)—underwent preliminary purifications of some kind (probably via fire and water; see Proclus, *ibid.*, and cf. fr. 133 and notes) and were clothed in special garments (cf. Proclus, *In rem p.*, II, 246, 23-25). We might suppose that in certain instances, the "caller" himself functioned as the medium. This is apparently the case in the magical papyri.[76]

The actual presence of the god was manifest in various ways. Iamblichus, for example (see *De myst.*, III.5), describes several types of divine possession (ἐπίπνοια, ἐνθουσιασμός, θεοφορία), each of which could be verified by certain physical reactions; e.g., levitation, bodily and facial movements, complete immobility, changes in voice, insensitivity to fire, etc. In addition, luminous apparitions often appeared, sometimes seen entering or leaving the medium's body. In this regard, Iamblichus (*De myst.*, III.6) distinguishes between apparitions seen by the "caller" (τῷ θεαγωγοῦντι), those viewed by the "receiver" (τῷ δεχομένῳ), and those witnessed by all (τοῖς πᾶσιν θεωροῦσι)—this last apparently the most desired effect.

Although distinctions of this type are not made in the extant fragments, the information we do have generally confirms Iamblichus' statements. In fr. 146, for example, the deity invoked (probably Hecate) is said to appear in a variety of luminous shapes; e.g., as a "fiery child," "sumptuous light," "dazzling horse," even a "formless fire" (from which the goddess communicated with the theurgist; cf. fr. 148). Other fragments (frr. 144 and 145) stress that the gods are initially without form (ἀτύπωτα) but take on various shapes in order to become visible to human sight, this "forming" process taking place either in the Ethereal or Empyrean realm (see fr. 144 and notes).

The technical terms for these "self-manifestations" are also found in the extant fragments; αὔτοπτον ἄγαλμα, fr. 101; αὐτόπτοις φάσμασιν, fr. 142 (but without clear distinctions). Proclus, on the other hand (following Iamblichus), distinguishes between *autoptic* visions (or those seen by the medium or receiver) and *epoptic* visions (or those viewed only by the caller; see the remarks of Psellus, *P.G.*, 122, 1136 c-d). This vocabulary of self-manifestation is also found in the magical papyri, sometimes in conjunction with the term σύστασις; e.g., αὔτοπτος σύστασις (*PGM* IV.220;

[76] See Lewy, p. 43, who claims that there is no instance in the magical papyri and literature of a "recipient" other than the "caller" himself. Thus, says Lewy: "We may therefore suppose that the Chaldeans derived their conception of the 'recipient'...from oracular usage." But Lewy's contention that the term δοχεύς is a Chaldean neologism is problematic; see notes to fr. 211.

930).[77] Whether these two terms were conflated in the Chaldean tradition as well is not known; Marinus, for one, suggests not. He tells us (*Vita Procli* 28) that Proclus, as part of his "theurgic labors" (θεουργικὰ ἐνεργήματα), first experienced luminous visions of Hecate (φάσμασι Ἑκατικοῖς φωτοειδέσιν αὐτοπτουμένοις) and then, as part of the "proper order" (ἐν τάξει), went on to experience the Chaldean "conjunctions" (συστάσεσι; see fr. 208). Since the extant fragments do point to some sort of orderly theurgic progression (see, e.g., the use of τάξις in fr. 110; cf. βαθμίς, fr. 164; cf., also, fr. 136 and notes), Marinus' remarks may well reflect a Chaldean *Vorlage*.

Now Dodds has likened these luminous visions to the "ectoplasm" of modern seances, and suggests that theurgic mediumship, in general, is not unlike that of present-day "spiritualism" (and even chides Lewy for not noting this "helpful analogy").[78] But is there really an analogy here? After all, the purpose of a seance is to communicate with dead friends and relatives, not to evoke a deity in the context of a "sacramental" rite. (The repeated insistence of the later Neoplatonists on this precise point cannot be overlooked.) Indeed, in what sense can we compare the "ectoplasm" of a deceased human with the luminous form of a god or goddess? Surely there is an important (even qualitative) difference here.[79]

### *C. Magical Instruments and Objects*

The "magic wheel" (στρόφαλος; see fr. 206) of Hecate was mentioned above in connection with the Iynges. Although this association is not explicitly made in the extant fragments (but cf. ἀόχνῳ στροφάλιγγι, frr. 49

---

[77] See Eitrem, "Théurgie," p. 56 ff.

[78] See "Theurgy," 1947, pp. 66-69 = 1957, pp. 296-299; "New Light," p. 269 = Lewy$^2$, p. 698. Cf. "Supernormal Phenomena in Classical Antiquity," (= chapt. X, pp. 156-210 of *The Ancient Concept of Progress,* Oxford, 1973) where Dodds again emphasizes the similarities between theurgy and modern-day spiritualism but notes here, in addition, the point I make, viz. that "with all their similarities there is associated one fundamental contrast: what the spiritualists ascribe to the activity of a discarnate human mind the theurgists normally attribute to gods or non-human daemons" (p. 206). Dodds accounts for this difference by stressing the pagan fear of the disembodied dead as "angry dangerous spirits" whose "company was not as a rule desired" (*ibid.*). The modern attitude towards the dead is, of course, far more benign. But I would still maintain that there is an important, indeed qualitative, distinction between communing with a god in the context of a theurgic rite and communing with one's dead grandmother in a darkened parlor.

[79] A closer "modern" parallel might be the ritual evocation of the goddess Astarte described by R. Ellwood, *Mysticism and Religion* (Englewood Cliffs, NJ, 1980), pp. 136-138. Ellwood claims that his experience culminated in "a powerful and unanticipated change of consciousness or bolt of ecstatic energy" which he likened (rightly or wrongly) to a "mystical experience."

and 87), Psellus equates the two (*P.G.*, 122, 1133 a 8-9). As Psellus describes it, this "magic wheel" (or Iynx) was a golden sphere embedded with a sapphire and swung around by means of a leather strap. On the surface of the wheel magical characters were engraved. By swinging this wheel, the theurgist would imitate the motion of the heavenly spheres and thus "sympathetically" attract the celestial Iynges (which would then function as "messengers" between the theurgist and the gods).[80] In addition, the swinging of this wheel could evidently be used for more profane ends. Marinus (*Vita Procli* 28; cf. fr. 208) tells us that Proclus, by using "certain Iynxes" (ἴυγγά τινα) caused rain to fall in Attica, thus ending a serious drought. Julian *fils*, as well, was known as a prodigious rainmaker; see *Suda*, s.v.

Brass instruments of some type (as well as birds) may also have been used in the Chaldean rites (see fr. 210 and notes), probably as an apotropaic means of warding off evil demons. (One is reminded here of the clanging of brass pots and pans at the time of the Roman Lemuria. As for the apotropaic use of birds, see, e.g., Porphyry, *De abst.*, 4.16.) Other apotropaic devices included the wearing of magical amulets, the offering of sacred stones (e.g., the *mnizouris* stone of fr. 149), as well as animal sacrifices.[81] None of this, of course, is original. Like all the rites discussed above, the use of instruments and objects was common magical fare. But in a theurgic context, these various practices take on salvific significance; the end result was not mere manipulation, but the very salvation of the soul.

### *D. Anagōgē*

Although the term ἀναγωγή does not appear in any of the undoubted fragments (but cf. ἀναγωγός, fr. 190 and notes), a developed doctrine of the ascent of the soul is clearly a Chaldean teaching. The term itself goes back to Plato, who used variants of ἀνάγειν to describe both the "ascent" of certain heroes from Hades to Olympus (e.g., *Rep.* VII, 521 c) as well as the "leading up" of the soul via dialectical reasoning (e.g., *Rep.* VII, 533 d).[82] It is in this latter sense that Plotinus develops this term—the Plotinian *anagōgē*, in effect, understood as a contemplative process which brings the soul to greater and greater degrees of intellectual purification. In contrast, the *Oracles* regard the "leading up" of the soul as a ritual event; here, the soul ascends on the "rays" of the sun aided both by the

[80] Eitrem compares this "magic wheel" of Hecate with the traditional *rhombos* of the magician; see "Théurgie," pp. 78-79.

[81] See Lewy, pp. 289-291.

[82] See Lewy, Exc. VIII, pp. 487-489.

theurgist and the gods. This difference in approach can be attributed to a fundamental difference in attitude towards the soul. Since Plotinus maintained that the higher (or rational) part of the soul remained unfallen, and therefore impassible, the individual need only recognize this fact, turn away (via his own moral efforts) from the material distractions of the lower soul, and return (via mental and philosophical disciplines) to his true nature—that of unfettered contemplation of the intelligible world. (Plotinus' purported success at combining his contemplative and active lives would certainly be personal testimony to this optimistic view of the soul.)[83]

In contrast, the *Oracles* place a much greater emphasis on the fall of the soul *in toto*; since the soul is in constant danger of becoming totally enslaved to matter (see discussion *supra*), there is a much greater need for aid, both divine and human, in restoring the soul to its elemental state. The *Oracles* especially place an emphasis on purifying the lower soul and its "vehicle" (or ὄχημα-πνεῦμα; see, e.g., fr. 104 and notes), as it is this vehicle (formed of accretions from the ether, sun, moon, and air; see fr. 61 and notes) which keeps the soul fettered in matter. Unhappily, the extant fragments do not give us any detailed information on the precise relation of this vehicle to the lower soul; it may even be the case that the two were sometimes conflated, but our evidence on this point is not secure (cf. fr. 158 and notes).

This doctrine of the ὄχημα-πνεῦμα, of course, does not originate with the *Oracles*.[84] It is a general Middle Platonic and Neoplatonic theme, found in a variety of sources, and ultimately reflects a creative reworking of Plato's statements about the "vehicles" (ὀχήματα) of the stars combined with Aristotle's reflections on the soul's πνεῦμα. (According to Dodds, the earliest extant passage where these two terms are linked is Galen's *De Placitis Hippocratis et Platonis*, p. 643 Muller.)[85] The principle role of the vehicle was to join the soul to the body; it thus functioned (in Synesius' words) as a "middle body" (μέσον σῶμα; *De insomn.*, 135 d)

---

[83] Cf. Porphyry, *De Vita Plot.* 8; see, also, the discussions in Wallis, pp. 82-90; Rist, pp. 213-230.

[84] For what follows, see Dodds, *Proclus: The Elements of Theology*, 2nd ed. (Oxford, 1963), App. II, "The Astral Body in Neoplatonism;" R. Kissling, "The OXHMA-ΠΝΕΥΜΑ of the Neoplatonists and the *De Insomniis* of Synesius of Cyrene," *AJP*, 43, 1922, pp. 318-330; Smith, App. Two, "The πνεῦμα/ὄχημα;" Trouillard, "Réflexions sur l'OXHMA dans les 'Éléments de Théologie' de Proclus," *REG*, LXX, 1957, pp. 102-107; Lewy, Exc. II, pp. 449-456; F. Cumont, *Lux Perpetua* (Paris, 1949), pp. 361-386; Dillon, *Iamblichi Chalcidensis Fragmenta*, (Leiden, 1973), pp. 371-377; J. Finamore, *Iamblichus and the Theory of the Vehicle of the Soul,* (Chico, CA, 1985). Cf., also, Proclus, *In Tim.*, III, 234, 19-235, 9; Porphyry, *De regressu an.*, pp. 27*,5-30*6; 31*,16-32*,25; 34*,28-35*,29, Bidez; Iamblichus, *De myst.*, III.11; 14; V.26.

[85] *Proclus: El. Th.*, p. 316.

which provided a mediating link between incorporeality and corporeality. The ὄχημα-πνεῦμα was also regarded as the seat of both sensation and imagination; Simplicius, for example, refers to the ὄχημα as both αἰσθητικόν and φανταστικόν (*De anima*, p. 17).[86]

Now the later Neoplatonists all accepted the doctrine of the ὄχημα-πνεῦμα, but with varying emphases. Porphyry, for example, believed that the vehicle was attached only to the irrational soul and that, after death, both would be resolved into their constituent elements. For Porphyry, only the rational or higher soul could truly be saved and only through the type of philosophical speculation espoused by Plotinus. In this regard, Porphyry—like Plotinus—argued that the higher soul never actually descended into matter, but remained eternally above in the intelligible order. Therefore, one need only exercise the power of his intellect via philosophical contemplation to revert back to his true nature. Although Porphyry conceded that theurgic praxis could purify the lower soul and its vehicle, the use of such ritual was of value only to the ordinary man who could not follow the entire Plotinian path. In any event, for Porphyry, theurgy could elevate the soul only to a position within the material world. It could never lead the soul back to the One.

Iamblichus, on the other hand, admitted that both the irrational soul and its vehicle were worthy of salvation (along with the rational or higher soul), and that all three could be purified by theurgy. Since Iamblichus maintained that the soul, in its entirety, was implicated in matter, the corresponding use of theurgy—at every level of the soul—could therefore elevate the soul beyond the material to the intelligible world and ultimately back to the One. This is also the case with Proclus who, in addition, further developed the theory of the soul's vehicle, asserting an immaterial "luminous body" (αὐγοειδὲς σῶμα) for the higher soul (not subject to corruption), as well as a perishable, material vehicle (πνευματικὸν ὄχημα) for the lower soul (see frr. 119, 120 and notes). Although Proclus believed that theurgy could purify both parts of the soul and their corresponding vehicles, only the higher soul and its immaterial vehicle would ultimately be saved.

As for Chaldean doctrine concerning the salvation of the ὄχημα-πνεῦμα, we are again on tentative ground. Dodds and Lewy, for example, had argued against its salvation.[87] Geudtner, however, based on an acute interpretation of the terminology in frr. 128 and 129 (see notes *ad loc.*), argues the opposite view, i.e., that the vehicle not only survives death but secures a post-mortem dwelling place in the Ethereal realm.[88] If this is

[86] This passage is cited by Kissling, p. 321.
[87] See Dodds, *Proclus: El. Th.*, p. 320; Lewy, p. 219, n. 166.
[88] Geudtner, pp. 18-24.

the case (and other scholars would concur), then the Chaldean position would prefigure that adopted by Iamblichus.

The next problem, then, is ascertaining the Chaldean position *vis-à-vis* the purification/salvation of the higher soul. As noted above, both Iamblichus and Proclus argued that the higher soul could be purified via theurgy; Porphyry said no, maintaining that contemplation alone (in the Plotinian manner) was effective at this level. If we look at the extant fragments, it is clear that a majority allude to obvious ritual/theurgic procedures (as described above); however, frr. 1 and 9a, in contrast, suggest some form of contemplative experience. In fr. 1, for example, the theurgist is counselled by the gods to "extend an empty mind" (τεῖναι κενεὸν νόον) towards the Highest God (or τι νοητόν) in order to "perceive" (νοεῖν) him. Similarly, in fr. 9a, the advice is "to extend the perceptive faculty in the soul" (anime noema ampliare) "towards the One" (in unum)—both of these experiences understood as a movement away from concrete, sensible images (cf. multivarium aliud, fr. 9a) towards an intuitive grasp of the Highest Reality. In fr. 1, this intuitive perception is achieved via the "flower/flame of mind;" i.e., that most discreet part of the mind which is akin to the fiery, intelligible essence of the Father.

Now this kind of language is strikingly reminiscent of Plotinus' *via negativa* approach to the One. In Plotinian terms, (e.g., *Enn.* VI.9.8-11), this ascent to the One involves a "stripping away" of multiplicity, a "putting away of otherness," a "going forth from the self," a "simplifying," a "self-surrender," an "extension towards contact," a "rest," the "flight of the alone to the Alone." For Plotinus, this ultimate experience—this "flight" of the solitary soul towards the solitary One—is specifically mediated through "the prime part of νοῦς" or "that element in νοῦς which is not νοῦς" but is akin to the One (see, e.g., *Enn.* V.5.8.22-23 and notes to fr. 1)—an obvious analogue to the Chaldean ἄνθος νοῦ.[89] Thus, in both instances, the ultimate experience is that of a supra-rational state of unified intuition at the very highest levels of ascent. Given these parallels, then, how are we to reconcile this apparent inner, contemplative apprehension of the Divine with the type of external, ritual theurgy generally associated with the Chaldean *anagōgē*?

Several solutions have been proposed. Cremer, for example (based on the remarks of Iamblichus in *De myst.*, VI.7), understands fr. 1 as descriptive of the passive mental attitude necessary for the theurgist to

---

[89] On Plotinus' mysticism in general see, e.g., J. M. Rist, *Plotinus: the Road to Reality*, (Cambridge, 1967), pp. 213-230; P. Hadot, "Neoplatonist Spirituality: I. Plotinus and Porphyry," in *Classical Mediterranean Spirituality*, pp. 230-249; R. T. Wallis, *Neoplatonism*, pp. 82-90; *idem*, "The Spiritual Importance of Not Knowing," in *Classical Mediterranean Spirituality*, esp. pp. 470-475.

achieve before he can proceed with his theurgic labors.[90] In this analysis, τι νοητόν would not signify the Highest God but be an equivalent expression for Iamblichus' μόνοι οἱ θεοί who, in contra-distinction to demons, must be approached "without violence" (οὐ σφοδρότητι, fr. 1 = οὐδαμοῦ ἀπειλή, *De myst.*, VI.7)— that is, "passively." Cremer would also equate Iamblichus' expression καθαρὸς λόγος with the ἄνθος νοῦ of fr. 1 and thus understand this latter term as expressive of the theurgist's "pure" (= "passive") approach to the gods. Although this is a suggestive interpretation, Cremer makes an important oversight—that Iamblichus elsewhere (*Comm. In Parm.*, frr. 2A and 2B Dillon; see notes to fr. 1) uses the ἄνθος νοῦ terminology precisely as it is most obviously used here; i.e., in connection with the contemplative apprehension of the Supreme God (or τι νοητόν).

Lewy's interpretation of fr. 1 is similarly problematic. Since Lewy, as Cremer, views the Chaldean *anagōgē* as strictly a ritual event, he, too, is forced to interpret the language of fr. 1 in like terms. Thus, for Lewy, the contemplative language of fr. 1 would not express a Plotinian-type experience as such, but reflect, instead, only the appropriation of Platonic philosophical terminology to express what, in fact, is a theurgic/ritual illumination. In Lewy's words:

> Plato compared the illumination accompanying the vision of the Ideas with that experienced by the initiate at the culminating point of the mystery. The Chaldeans, on the other hand, used the image of philosophical vision in order to represent the illumination of their initiate. Their equivocal mode of expression gave the Neoplatonists the possibility to interpret the injunctions of the Oracles concerning ritual ceremonies as figurative expressions of spiritual experiences; they could thus identify the Chaldean mystery of the ascent towards the divine light with the Plotinian intellectual process of self-perfection which is independent of all external action. The greater part of their injunctions relating to the accomplishment of the Chaldean mystery of immortality receive in the texts in which they have come down to us a spiritual interpretation.[91]

Although Lewy is correct, methodologically, to caution against accepting, *prima facie*, the various Neoplatonizing interpretations of the *Oracles*, he is guilty of overstatement when he suggests that most of these interpretations must then be considered suspect. Indeed, it may be the case that the Neoplatonists gave a "spiritual" interpretation to many of the injunctions of the *Oracles* (including fr. 1) precisely because this was their intent in the first place.

---

[90] Cremer, pp. 11-13; cf. p. 125.
[91] Lewy, p. 176.

Hadot, for one, is aware of this and asks, in particular, whether the *Oracles* actually proposed two alternative methods of ascent; i.e., a theurgic method and a "purely spiritual" method. To reconcile this apparent contradiction, Hadot suggests that the Chaldean *anagōgē* may well have been close to Porphyrian conceptions, viz. theurgical purification for the lower soul, leading to union with the lesser gods; philosophical or contemplative purification for the higher soul, culminating in union with the One (or Chaldean Father).[92] A. Smith makes a similar observation but prefers to speak in terms of a "lower" and "higher" theurgy, the former concerned with the "lower gods" and therefore "material in its ritual," the latter addressed to the "transcendent gods" and, therefore, "less material" (if at all) in its "ritual elements." Smith's distinction is based primarily on his reading of Iamblichus' *De mysteriis*, but suggests that some form of "lower" and "higher" theurgy may already have been present in the *Oracles*.[93]

The problem here is that Hadot seemingly wants to maintain a distinction between theurgy per se and philosophical contemplation as an activity devoid of theurgic elements, whereas Smith wants to include a theurgic or ritual dimension at even the highest levels of ascent. However, Smith equivocates on this last point and admits (with specific regard to Proclus) that "one might suppose that the word theurgy was sometimes not applied to the very highest level of ascent."[94] Elsewhere, Smith notes that Proclus apparently "cuts theurgy short" at the level of the νοητοὶ θεοί, thus separating theurgic praxis from the activity of the ἄνθος νοῦ. At the highest level of ascent, there is only "silence" and the experience of νόησις.[95] Marinus (*Vita Procli* 3) alludes to the same division when he posits a grade of "supra-human" virtues over that of the "theurgic" virtues. Smith remarks: "It is noteworthy that the highest virtues are passed over in silence, a perhaps not altogether fortuitous use

---

[92] "Bilan et perspectives," pp. 718-719.

[93] Smith, pp. 90-99; 130-132. Cf., e.g., Iamblichus, *De myst.*, IV.2: τῆς ὅλης θεουργίας διττόν ἐστι πρόσχημα; V.15: πάλιν οὖν ἥκει τῆς θρησκείας ὁ διπλοῦς τρόπος· ὁ μὲν γὰρ ἔσται ἁπλοῦς ἀσώματος ἁγνὸς ἀπὸ πάσης γενέσεως...ὁ δ' ἀναπιμπλάμενος τῶν σωμάτων καὶ τῆς ἐνύλου πάσης πραγματείας.

[94] Smith, p. 113.

[95] Smith, p. 112. Cf. A. Sheppard, "Proclus' Attitude to Theurgy," *CQ*, 32, 1982, pp. 212-224, who elaborates on Smith's analysis by distinguishing three levels of theurgy in Proclus' writings; forms of "white magic" (as esp. emphasized by Marinus in his *Life of Proclus*), forms of ritual theurgy that make "the soul intellectually alive" by elevating it to a level within the intelligible realm, and a non-ritual, "internal" theurgy akin to Plotinian mysticism. This last form of theurgy (following Smith) would principally utilize the "activating" power of the "one" as a *symbolon* within the soul as the means of uniting the soul with the transcendent One. Such an analysis of the final stages of ascent may apply to the *Oracles* as well (see further *infra*).

of the word which recalls that region of silence at the summit of the noetic world.''[96]

A similar distinction is made by Festugière who demonstrates that for Proclus, theurgy was a means of purifying the ὄχημα-πνεῦμα in particular (and thus permitting union with the ''traditional gods'') whereas contemplation via the ἄνθος νοῦ permitted union with the ''god of the philosophers,'' i.e., the One. Festugière's argument is further illumined by a similar distinction in the writings of Hierocles, a contemporary of Proclus.[97]

As for Iamblichus, although he does not focus on union with the One in the *De mysteriis*, he nonetheless alludes to some sort of trans-theurgical moment in the ascent when he states in X.6 that the τέλος of the ἱερατικῆς (= theurgic) ἀναγωγῆς is establishing the soul in the ὅλῳ τῷ δημιουργικῷ θεῷ[98] and, therefore, at a level lower than that of the Supreme God. The same point is made in X.5. Elsewhere (as noted *supra*), Iamblichus (like Proclus) asserts the role of the ἄνθος νοῦ in apprehending the Highest God.

It is clear, then, that the later Neoplatonists were all trying to maintain some sort of distinction between theurgy and contemplation, with any attendant confusion arising more from their attempt to combine these two modes of ascent rather than rigidly separate them. (Porphyry would be the exception here.) If this is the case, then, did this attempt stem principally from a desire to wed Plotinus with the *Juliani* (as Lewy contends), or from a pattern implicit in the *Oracles* themselves? I would suggest the latter, and propose the following stages of ascent:

1. First of all, it is clear that the initial stages involved the purification of the lower soul/ὄχημα-πνεῦμα via a series of material rites. Psellus, for example (*P.G.*, 122, 1132 a 8-12), tells us that τὸ τῆς ψυχῆς ὄχημα is ''strengthened'' (δυναμώσομεν) or ''purified'' (καθαίρεσθαι) via ''stones'' (λίθοις), ''herbs'' (πόαις), and ''incantations'' (ἐπῳδαῖς), thus making it ''well-wheeled'' (εὔτροχον) for the ascent. Marinus (*Vita Procli* 28; cf. fr. 206) tells us that Proclus was not only proficient in the use of the Chal-

---

[96] Smith, p. 113.

[97] ''Contemplation philosophique et Art théurgique chez Proclus,'' *Studi di Storia Religiosa della Tarda Antichita* (Messina, 1968), pp. 7-18. But cf. J. Trouillard, ''Le Merveilleux dans la Vie et la Pensée de Proclus,'' *RPFE*, 163, 1973, p. 452, who argues, *contra* Festugière, that ''Proclus n'est pas double...il a bien intégré à sa démarche philosophique son goût du merveilleux.'' See, also, G. Shaw, ''Theurgy: Rituals of Unification in the Neoplatonism of Iamblichus,'' *Traditio*, 41, 1985, pp. 1-98 who, influenced by Trouillard's analysis, now makes a similar case for Iamblichus.

[98] This point is also noted by Finamore, *Iamblichus and the Theory of the Vehicle of the Soul*, p. 162, n. 66. On Iamblichus' demiurgic notions in general, see Dillon, *Iamblichi Fragmenta*, pp. 37-39; Festugière, *Rév.*, IV, pp. 280-282.

dean "conjunctions," "prayers," and "magic wheels" (as well as experiencing *autoptic* visions of Hecate), but that he indulged in numerous lustrations (cf. fr. 133 and note). Elsewhere, Proclus himself mentions the use of "herbs" and "stones" in connection with "purifications" (καθάρσεις) by "sea water" and "sulphur" *(De Magia*; p. 151, 5-9 Bidez. Marinus, *ibid.*, similarly mentions, in general, that Proclus τοῖς Χαλδαϊκοῖς καθαρμοῖς καθαιρόμενος.) All of these rites, then, would correspond to certain of the theurgical procedures discussed above. However, to what extent all or just some of these rites were considered a necessary prelude to the main elevation cannot be recovered from our sources, other than to note some sort of orderly progression (most likely over a period of time). In this regard, cf. Iamblichus, *De myst.*, V.20, who mentions "those in the beginning of theurgy," "those in the middle," and those "few" who attain the "summit of the hieratic art," but only after "great pain" and "late in life."

2. Now, part of this process involved what Lewy called "the central Chaldean sacrament;" i.e., the elevation of the soul on the rays of the sun. Again, the precise order of events here must be tentatively reconstructed from various sources, including the extant fragments. For the most part, I have followed Lewy's lead, but with certain modifications.

a. According to Lewy, a ritual "burying" of the body (as reported by Proclus; see *Th. pl.*, IV.9; p. 30, 17 ff., S.-W.) preceded the actual elevation on the sun's rays (which Proclus, *ibid.*, alludes to as "the most secret of initiations:" ἐν τῇ μυστικωτάτῃ τῶν τελετῶν).[99] The apparent purpose of this rite was to mimic death, so that the soul (as in its actual post-mortem state) could be properly separated from the body. To this end, the head of the initiate was left uncovered, as this was where the soul was believed to reside. But Lewy's further interpretation of this rite as a "mystic, voluntary suicide"[100] is surely wrong. Not only is the notion of death by violence (symbolic or otherwise) not attested as a Chaldean doctrine, but the one fragment which might support such a position is clearly misread by Lewy (see fr. 159 and notes). A better interpretation of this Proclan passage, then, is that of Saffrey and Westerink (see notes *ad loc.*), who suggest that this symbolic burial would correspond to the sixth "kind" of death enumerated by Damascius (*In Phaed.*, II § 149,7-8), viz.

---

[99] See Lewy, pp. 204-207.

[100] Lewy, pp. 205-206. But whether this elevation was further acted out in terms of an actual "fire cult" is problematic. Kroll (p. 55, and thus Dodds, "Theurgy," 1947, p. 56 = 1957, p. 285) thought yes, and suggested an analogy with the "fire cult" of the Zoroastrians. But Lewy (rightly, I think) discounts this analogy, principally citing lack of evidence (see p. 429, n. 104).

the "supernatural death" or "more divine way" of the theurgists, in which the elements of the body (symbolically) "dissolve" (thus assuring that the body, in its post-mortem state, will be free of demonic vengeance).

b. Once the body was symbolically "dead," then the soul could be properly separated from it; but the precise nature of this separation must be conjectured. Certain clues, however, are given by Syrianus (as reported by Proclus; see *In rem p.*, I, 152, 7-153, 20) who likens the Chaldean initiation to the funeral rites performed by Achilles at the burial of Patroclus. In this analogy (as interpreted by Lewy), the officiant at the rite (modelled on Achilles) would perform the actual separation by "calling forth" the soul of the initiate; the initiate, in turn, would be "laid out" (or symbolically "buried") in the manner of Patroclus.[101]

Another possibility (perhaps performed in conjunction with the above) is that the initiate himself would aid in releasing the soul by engaging in certain breathing exercises. Fr. 124, for example, states that the soul is "thrust forth" (ἐξωστῆρες) by "inhaling" (ἀνάπνοοι). Similarly, in fr. 130, the soul (at a higher level of ascent) "draws in" (ἕλκουσαι) the "flowering flames" (πυρσοὺς ἀχμαίους) which descend "from the Father" (ἐκ πατρόθεν). Westerink, (see notes to fr. 130) thinks specifically here in terms of "feeding on" or "breathing in" sunlight. A similar process of "drawing in" or "inhaling" the sun's rays or "breath" is found in the *Mithras Liturgy* (p. 7, Meyer): "Draw in (ἕλκε) breath (πνεῦμα) from the rays, drawing in (ἀνασπῶν) three times as much as you can, and you will see yourself being lifted up and ascending to the height, so that you seem to be in mid-air." As Meyer notes (p. ix), this passage probably reflects some type of actual breathing technique, an observation apropos for the Chaldean material as well. Certainly, breathing techniques of one kind or another are a common feature of a wide variety of ascent traditions.[102]

c. Following this initial release, then, the separated soul would be led upward on the rays of the sun (or "Material Connectors;" see fr. 80), making its way back up through the various spheres and elements which marked its descent (see fr. 110 and notes). This principal elevation would again be guided by the theurgist, with the aid of ministering angels (see frr. 122, 123 and notes) and the three Teletarchs (see fr. 85 and notes). In addition, the soul's ascent would be aided by the singing of hymns (see fr. 131 and notes), the uttering of prayers (cf. fr. 140 and notes), and the chanting of *voces mysticae*. In Chaldean terminology, these last would be

---

[101] Lewy, pp. 206-207.

[102] See, e.g., M. Eliade, *Yoga: Immortality and Freedom*, (Princeton, 1958), pp. 55-65, for a discussion of such techniques in a variety of religious traditions.

the συνθήματα and σύμβολα, identified with the Iynges (cf. fr. 87 and notes) and thus described in fr. 108 as "sown throughout the cosmos by the Father." As such, these "tokens" and "symbols" have both material and immaterial manifestations. In the former instance, they are equated with the stones, herbs, scents, etc. handled by the theurgist during some of the preliminary rites (as discussed above). In the latter instance, they are imbedded in the soul as *voces mysticae*, serving not only as a means of prodding the soul upward, but also having the power to ward off demonic attack (see fr. 2 and notes). With this protection, then, the soul enters or "hastens" (see fr. 115) towards the streams of light, is drawn upward, "mingles" with the solar "channels" or "rays" (see fr. 66) and is ultimately established in the sun itself (see fr. 111)—"the seven-rayed god" (ὁ ἑπτάκτις θεός; see fr. 194). As such, this ascent to the sun (in Lewy's interpretation) would be the culminating event of the entire *anagōgē*—the rays of the sun, in effect, accomplishing the final purification of the soul and thus rendering it "immortal" (ἀπαθανατισμός; see Proclus, *In rem p.*, I, 152, 10).[103]

But this purification (in Lewy's analysis) would not be limited simply to the purifying effects of the visible or mundane sun, but would involve, as well, the intelligible purification of the rational soul via the "noetic" or intelligible rays of Aion—the transmundane sun—whose "light," in turn, would derive from the intelligible fire of the Father; these "noetic rays," then, descending from the Father via Aion to the visible sun, where the elevated soul "rests" (and is consequently "purified;" see fr. 130 and notes). As a noetic experience, then (argues Lewy), this purification—although expressed in "noetic" or contemplative language (as in fr. 1)—would, in fact, remain strictly a ritual event, conducted by the theurgist, and accompanied "by magical operations, invocations, recitals, and above all by numerous luminous visions."[104] Thus, for Lewy, this elevation, *in fine*, would take the form of a sublime *epopteia*, similar to that described in the *Mithras Liturgy*, where the adept ascends on the rays of the sun to the Great God Aion-Helios-Mithra, and is subsequently "immortalized."

What Lewy fails to appreciate, however, is that Chaldean utilization of "intellectual" or "philosophical" language to describe the highest moments of ascent may not simply reflect an equation of "magical" and "intellectual" processes (with the rites alone effecting purification),[105] but point instead to a genuine contemplative experience free of external

---

[103] See Lewy, esp. pp. 198-199.
[104] See Lewy, p. 208; cf. pp. 184-204.
[105] See Lewy, esp. pp. 174-176.

manipulation. (This contemplative element is importantly missing from the ascent described in the *Mithras Liturgy*.) If so, the ascent to the sun would not effect the final purification of the soul (i.e., that of the higher or rational soul) but, rather, would serve only to fully purify the ὄχημα-πνεῦμα—the salvation of which is promised by the *Oracles* (see esp. frr. 128, 129, 158 and notes; cf. fr. 196).

Following this line of interpretation, then, the Chaldean *anagōgē*, as a whole, would parallel that of Porphyry (as Hadot suggests); i.e., theurgical purification for the lower soul/ὄχημα-πνεῦμα, intellectual or comtemplative purification for the higher soul. This is the same model Festugière finds appropriate for Proclus. However, in Proclus' case (as noted above), a clear separation between theurgy and contemplation is not always easy to determine. This caveat would also apply to Iamblichus, as both see theurgy, in some form, as extending to the higher soul. What needs to be determined now is just what theurgy means at this higher level, and is a "higher" theurgy operative in the *Oracles* as well?

A distinction between types of theurgy, of course, has already been noted by various scholars. We have already mentioned Smith's "lower" and "higher" theurgy, the former restricted to material rites connected with the "lower gods," the latter concerned with worship of the "transcendent gods." Eitrem also distinguishes types of theurgy and, in terms of the *Oracles*, notes a "contemplative theurgy" (or "theoretical theurgy"), as well as a "practical theurgy," the former corresponding to the theosophical speculations of the Chaldeans, the latter to the actual techniques of ascent. For Eitrem, then, there is no contemplative aspect to the ascent per se, but only those ritual practices which he analogizes to the *systaseis* and *epopteiai* of the magical papyri.[106]

Rosan, in his study of Proclus, also speaks in terms of a "lower" and "higher" theurgy, understanding the former as "theurgy proper" (and thus relegated to the use of material objects), the latter equated with Proclan *pistis*.[107] In this latter sense, Proclus, at times (e.g., *Th. pl.*, I.25; p. 112, 1-3, S.-W.; *Comm. In Parm.*, p. 502, 10-12, ed. C. Steel = p. 42, 15-16, Kl.-Lab.), regards *pistis* as the primary means of union with the One, arguing that it is "faith" (as a "theurgic power") which properly engenders that "silence" within the soul which is the appropriate mode of response to the "silence" of the noetic "deep" where the One (or Father) resides (cf. *Th. pl.*, IV.9; p. 31, 12-16, S.-W.; see frr. 16, 132

---

[106] "Théurgie," pp. 51-52. The same distinction is made by Cremer, pp. 20-21.

[107] L. J. Rosan, *The Philosophy of Proclus* (New York, 1949), pp. 213-215 and n. 152; Cf. Rist, *Plotinus,* pp. 231-246.

and notes). Elsewhere, however (e.g., *Exc. chald.*, IV; *In Alc.* I, p. 114 [248,3 Cr.] W.; *Th. pl.*, I.3; p. 15, 3-4, S.-W.), Proclus uses the ἄνθος νοῦ terminology to express the soul's union with the One, this union understood in the manner described above, viz. as a supra-rational state of unified intuition.

Now, although Smith sees Proclus as sometimes distinguishing theurgy from the activity of the ἄνθος νοῦ (see *supra*), he also suggests that Proclus may well have regarded the ἄνθος νοῦ as that "token" or σύνθημα of the One within the soul (and, thus, would have regarded it, in some sense, as a "theurgic" device).[108] As evidence, Smith (apparently following Bremond)[109] cites *In rem p.*, I, 177, 17-24, where Proclus speaks of the "unifying substance" (ἑνιαίας ὑποστάσεως) of the soul as τὸ ἄρρητον σύνθημα which (based on the principle "like by like") unites the transcendent One (or τῷ ὑπὲρ οὐσίαν πάσαν καὶ ζωήν) with its proper "essence" (οὐσίας) and "life" (ζωῆς) within the soul. Elsewhere (e.g., *In Alc.* I, p. 114 [247,7-248,4 Cr.] W.), Proclus specifically describes the ascent to the One in terms of ascending to αὐτὴν τὴν ἄκραν ὕπαρξιν τῆς ψυχῆς which, for Proclus, is the ἄνθος τῆς οὐσίας ἡμῶν or τὸ ἄνθος τοῦ νοῦ.[110] At this point, the soul is unified by "becoming one" (ἓν γενόμενοι) and "acting as one" (ἑνοειδῶς ἐνεργήσαντες).

In light of these passages, then, there can be no doubt that Proclus did indeed equate the ἄνθος νοῦ with the term σύνθημα and understood it specifically as the "unifying power" of the soul. Psellus corroborates this. In his commentary to our fr. 1 (= *P.G.*, 122, 1144 b 11-12), he exactly states: ἄνθος δὲ τοῦ νοῦ ἡ ἑνιαία τῆς ψυχῆς δύναμις. In addition, in his commentary to our fr. 110 (= *P.G.*, 122, 1129 d 4-7), Psellus understands the ἱερὸς λόγος of the soul as both ἡ νοερωτέρα ζωὴ as well as ἡ ὑψηλοτέρα δὺναμις τῆς ψυχῆς, ἢ ἄνθος νοῦ ἐν ἑτέροις ὀνομάζει τὸ λόγιον. Elsewhere, Psellus (quoting Proclus) states that the soul is formed ἀπὸ

---

[108] Smith, p. 120.

[109] See Smith, *ibid.*; cf. A. Bremond, "Un Texte de Proclus sur la Prière et l'Union Divine," *RSR*, 19, 1929, pp. 460-462 who, like Smith, similarly equates the σύνθημα of unity within the soul with the ἄνθος νοῦ. Although Smith does not specifically cite Bremond here, he does cite this article in his bibliography. Cf., also, Sheppard, "Proclus' Attitude to Theurgy," p. 221: "...Proclus thinks of the 'one in the soul' as a σύμβολον of the First Hypostasis and that it is because of this σύμβολον-relationship that mystical union is possible...mystical union could be described as a lofty kind of theurgy because turning the 'one in the soul' towards the supreme One was thought of as activating a σύμβολον in the direction of what it symbolized."

[110] See J. M. Rist, "Mysticism and Transcendence in Later Neoplatonism," *Hermes*, 92, 1964, pp. 213-225; W. Beierwaltes, "Der Begriff des 'unum in nobis' bei Proklos," in *Die Metaphysik im Mittelalter*, (Berlin, 1963), pp. 255-266. Cf. H. D. Saffrey, "Neoplatonist Spirituality: II. From Iamblichus to Proclus and Damascius," in *Classical Mediterranean Spirituality*, pp. 250-265; R. T. Wallis, "The Spiritual Importance of Not Knowing," in *ibid.*, pp. 475-478.

τῶν ἱερῶν λόγων καὶ τῶν θείων συμβόλων (see *P.G.*, 122, 1148 b 7-8 = Proclus, *Exc. chald.*, V; p. 195, 18-19 Pitra; see notes to fr. 109).[111] In sum, then, for Proclus, the highest "unifying power" of the soul would be precisely that theurgic "sacred word" or "divine token/symbol" understood as the "flower of mind" or ἄνθος νοῦ (= "one" in the soul; e.g. *In Parm.*, 1071, 25-31).

In this analysis, then, the highest levels of ascent, for Proclus, would utilize both a contemplative as well as theurgic technique; i.e., a process of intelligible perception (as outlined, e.g., in *In Alc.*, I, pp. 113-115 [246,3-249,14 Cr.], W.) combined with the unifying or "theurgic" power of the ἄνθος νοῦ as a σύνθημα. A similar process is described in *Th. pl.*, IV.11; p. 35, 11-38, 27, S.-W., where the *via negativa* approach to the One, as well as aspects of the intelligible world in general, are combined with the graded use of various συνθήματα. In addition, Proclus also admits the efficacy of hymns offered to various classes of transcendent beings (e.g., *Th. pl.*, II.11; p. 65, 5-15, S.-W.; IV.16; p. 50, 11-28, S.-W.; cf., also, the "hymn" to the νοεροὶ θεοί, fr. 18 and notes) and in one instance (*Exc. chald.*, I; p. 192, 23-25 Pitra) equates the "intellectual" (νοεροί) and "invisible" (ἀφανεῖς) hymns "of the ascending soul" (τῆς ἀναγομένης ψυχῆς) with "the ineffable tokens of the Father" (τὰ συνθήματα τοῦ πατρὸς τὰ ἄρρητα). In *Exc. chald.*, II; p. 193, 12 Pitra, the hymn offered to the Father is, in effect, the soul's "assimilation" (ἐξομοίωσιν) to him.[112] And here, Proclus specifically rejects both the ordinary forms of hymnal praise (λόγοι σύνθετοι or κενῇ ῥημάτων καταιγίδι) as well as external rites (ἔργων κατασκευή or ἔργων φαντασίᾳ μετὰ τέχνης κεκαλλωπισμένων) as effective at the higher levels of ascent. This is also true with regard to Proclus' theory of prayer, since Proclus understands "perfect" (τελεία) or "true" (ἀληθινή) prayer not in terms of ordinary vocal speech, but as an interior five-fold process of ascent which culminates in union (ἕνωσις) with the gods. As such, the function of "perfect" prayer is precisely that of evoking or awakening within the soul those very "tokens" (or συνθήματα) of the gods which, in turn, effect this union (see *In Tim.*, I,

---

[111] In terms of Proclus' text, Sheppard ("Proclus' Attitude to Theurgy," p. 220, n. 28) reads νοεροὶ λογοί here (following Jahn) rather than ἱεροὶ λογοί (Des Places). Des Places' reading, however, remains the better choice as it is obviously based on confirmation from Psellus as well as the *Oracles* (cf. fr. 110: ἱερῷ λόγῳ; fr. 175: ἱεροῦ λόγου). It is likely that the νοερῶν of codd. B and V of *Exc. chald.* (cod. P has ἱερῶν) is a copyist's error based on "attraction" from the subsequent line: ἀπὸ τῶν νοερῶν εἰδῶν.

[112] Trouillard, *L'Un et l'Ame*, p. 178, likens Proclus' understanding of prayer to the "orison" or "ontological prayer" of the Christian mystics which, similarly, is not to be understood in terms of ordinary prayer but as the soul's turning towards and uniting with God. For further discussion, see E. Underhill, *Mysticism*, 12th ed. (New York, 1972), p. 306 ff.

210, 27-212, 1. Cf., also, Iamblichus, *De myst.*, V.26, who similarly underscores the "elevating" (ἀναγωγόν) force of prayer. It may be that Iamblichus' theory of prayer (on which Proclus is dependent) may ultimately go back to Chaldean doctrine; see fr. 121 and notes).

In any event, based again on the principle "like by like" (see *Exc. chald.*, IV; p. 194, 10 Pitra), Proclus insists that the One (and the intelligible world as a whole) must be apprehended by the "like" part of the soul—the One itself apprehended here (*ibid.*, p. 195, 4 ff. Pitra) not by the "flower of mind" but by an even more refined essence, the "flower of the whole soul" (ἄνθος πασῆς τῆς ψυχῆς; see notes to fr. 1). Thus, for Proclus, the higher levels of ascent would involve not only a process of intelligible or noetic contemplation (in the Plotinian sense), but a type of "higher" theurgy as well, this latter involving the use of "perfect" prayer, *synthēmata*, noetic hymning, sacred silences, theurgic "faith," the ἄνθος νοῦ—all of which had the power to elevate the soul and effect union with various aspects of the intelligible world, including the One itself.

Such a model seems appropriate for the *Oracles* as well, principally because it would permit us to give full weight to the contemplative language of frr. 1 and 9a (cf., also, frr. 17-19 and notes) without negating those aspects of the *anagōgē* which would remain properly theurgic. As such, we can suppose that the ἄνθος νοῦ of the fragments would similarly function as a σύνθημα or theurgic device or "power" and not solely as an organ of contemplative perception. Although the terms ἄνθος νοῦ and σύνθημα are not explicitly equated in the fragments, it may well be that the "pure Paternal token" (πατρικοῦ συνθήματος ἁγνοῦ) of fr. 109, as well as the τριάδος σύνθημα of fr. 2 should be understood in this sense. This would also be true of the Chaldean term ἀλκή ("strength")—an equivalent expression in the *Oracles* for the "spark of soul" or "flower/flame of mind" (cf. frr. 2, 32, 49, 82, 117-119). In fr. 2, it is specifically the "triple-barbed strength" in the soul which is equated with the τριάδος σύνθημα as that theurgic force or power which functions as a "focusing" device to prod the soul upward. In fr. 117, certain adepts (probably the theurgists) are said to be "saved" through their own "strength;" in fr. 119, the soul's "strength" is said to "bind (us) to god" (θεοσυνδέτου ἀλκῆς) for the purpose of "exciting us towards the flight up there;" in fr. 109, the soul emerges from "forgetfulness" when it "remembers" the "pure, Paternal token" or, in Psellus' interpretation (see *supra*), that "sacred word" or "symbol" in the soul understood as the ἄνθος νοῦ. This evidence suggests, then, that in the *Oracles*, the soul's "flower/flame," "spark," or "strength," did indeed function as a "token" or σύνθημα which specifically had the power to theurgically

"focus" and elevate the soul and, ultimately, to "bind" or unite it with its noetic counterpart, viz. the fiery, triadic essence of the Highest God or τι νοητόν. If so, then the teaching of the *Oracles* regarding the highest levels of ascent would prefigure, in many ways, the ideas especially elaborated by Proclus.

Now, a comparable process of ascent can also be found in various Gnostic and Hermetic texts, where patterns of noetic hymning and prayer, sacred silences, *voces mysticae*, etc., are combined with various forms of contemplative illumination as a means of prodding the soul upward. Of particular interest are several of the so-called "Sethian" tractates found in the Nag Hammadi Library (e.g., *Allogenes*, *Marsanes*, *3 Steles Seth*, *Zostrianos*), some (or even all) of which may have been known to the school of Plotinus.[113] As noted earlier, a similar Platonic philosophical vocabulary (familiar to the *Oracles* as well) is used in all of these texts to describe aspects of the intelligible world with an emphasis, in particular, on a "triple-powered" One or Monad situated at the heights of the noetic order. The ascent to this Deity, like the ascent to the Chaldean πατήρ, similarly involves not only some form of philosophical or contemplative purification (the negative theology of *Allogenes*, NHC XI, 61,32 ff. is particularly striking), but the use of *voces mysticae*, hymnic prayers, sacred silences, "sealing," etc.[114]

The thirteen "seals" (σφραγίδες) of *Marsanes*, NHC X, 2,12 ff. are especially interesting. Here, the first three "seals" are specifically connected with the material world (and, perhaps, with the use of the "waxen images" and "emerald stones" mentioned later in the text; see 35*,1-6), the other seals apparently progressively concerned with various aspects of "incorporeal" existence (e.g., "conversion," "the self-begotten ones," "incorporeal being," "wisdom," etc), the thirteenth or highest seal related in some way to the Supreme God or "Silent One." Although the precise nature of these "seals" is not disclosed in the text, Pearson (notes *ad loc.*) suggests that they would correspond either to the *voces mysticae* or divine names associated with various angelic powers or to a ritual of "baptism".[115] In either case, it is the "sealing" itself which ap-

[113] See Robinson, "Steles Seth," p. 132; Pearson, "Tractate Marsanes," p. 375; Schenke, "Phenomenon," pp. 612-614.

[114] For an insightful analysis of the patterns of ascent (and descent) in *Allogenes*, *Zostrianos*, and *3 Steles Seth*, see J. Turner, "The Gnostic Threefold Path to Enlightenment," *NT*, 22, 1980, pp. 324-351. Cf., also, R. T. Wallis, "The Spiritual Importance of Not Knowing," pp. 467-470.

[115] Whether this baptism should be understood as an actual rite performed with water or as a type of inner, spiritual "sealing" is problematic. Pearson, *Nag Hammadi Codices IX and X* (Leiden, 1981), pp. 248-249, suggests the former, as does Schenke ("Phenomenon," pp. 602-607); Schenke, however, would not absolutely rule out some

parently effects the soul's ascent and, consequently, permits the adept to attain "knowledge" or "perception" of the various levels of the intelligible order.

Now, in the *Oracles*, the συνθήματα and σύμβολα function in a similar way. Not only do these "tokens" and "symbols" have a material association (identified with the stones, herbs, scents, etc. handled in some of the preliminary rites), but they have an immaterial manifestation as well (esp. in the form of *voces mysticae*. Indeed, Synesius uses the terms σύνθημα and σφραγίς interchangeably in an anagogic context; see notes to fr. 2.) Thus, to borrow Proclus' language, "participation" (μέθεξις) in the συνθήματα/σύμβολα—at whatever level—is the principal means by which the soul reverts back to the gods and, ultimately, to the Highest God himself. (With regard to Proclus, Smith speaks in terms of ascending from "corporally immanent henads or συνθήματα to those immanent on higher spiritual levels.")[116] This seems to be the case with the *Marsanes* text as well. If so, then this text would provide a further link between aspects of Sethian Gnosticism and the tradition(s) on which the *Oracles* drew (with Syria, perhaps, as a common geographical locus).[117]

This brings us to the matter of the text. Although I have based my ordering of the fragments on that of Des Places (*Oracles Chaldaïques*, Paris, 1971), unlike Des Places, I have also included the introductory formulae which, for the most part, are found in Kroll's edition (*De Oraculis Chaldaicis*, Breslau, 1894; rpt. Hildesheim, 1962).[118] The exception here are those fragments from Psellus (*P.G.*, 122, 1124 a - 1149 b) which do not include introductory material but only a given verse or verses with an appended commentary. Where applicable, Psellus' paraphrase of a given verse is included in our text. In addition, the present text also includes the Latin fragments from Moerbeke's translation of Proclus' *Com-*

---

form of "spiritualized" baptism (see p. 606). In contrast, L. Koenen, "From Baptism to the Gnosis of Manichaeism," *Rediscovery*, II, pp. 734-756, argues that among the Manichaeans (as well as other Gnostics, including "Sethians"), water baptism was regularly replaced by "gnosis;" thus, the recurring expression "living water" found in various Gnostic texts, should be understood only in this sublimated, spiritual sense.

[116] See Smith, p. 120.

[117] Although Pearson (*Nag Hammadi Codices IX and X*, p. 250) suggests a possible Syrian background for the author of Marsanes (as does Saffrey for the *Juliani*), this "Syrian connection" must remain tentative.

[118] Prior to Kroll, G. Plethon (c. 1360-1452 C.E.) had evidently put together a collection of the *Oracles* but under the name of Zoroaster; see J. Bidez and F. Cumont, *Les Mages Hellénisés*, II (Paris, 1938; rpt. 1973), pp. 251-263. J. P. Migne placed this collection with Psellus' commentaries on the *Oracles* (*P.G.*, 122, 1115 a - 1122 b). Apart from Lewy's study, the only other English translations of the *Oracles* are those of G. R. S. Mead, *Echoes from the Gnosis*, VIII (London and Benares, 1908) and Sapere Aude, *The Chaldean Oracles of Zoroaster*, (Bothell, WA, 1984), but these are extremely unreliable "loose" translations and attempts at interpretation.

*mentary on the Parmenides*, VII (ed. C. Steel, 1985; cf. Klibansky-Labowsky, 1953) recently isolated by H.-D. Saffrey (frr. 9 and 9a), as well as three additions to the section on "Various Chaldean Expressions" now suggested by Des Places (frr. 210a-c). Fragments noted with an asterisk indicate that Tardieu (Lewy$^2$, pp. 679-680) finds these fragments suspect (in addition to the "Doubtful Fragments" numbered 211-226). Since the present text is not meant to be a new critical edition, I have not excised these suspect fragments (as Tardieu suggests), but have included all of Tardieu's reservations in my commentary.[119] Following Dodds and Des Places, I have also excluded those fragments from the *Tübingen Theosophia* (ed. K. Buresch, 1889) which Lewy had erroneously thought were Chaldean in origin.[120]

The oracular fragments in the Greek text have been arranged in stichoi (following Des Places) with three dots at the beginning or end of a line of verse indicating a truncated hexameter.

[119] It should be noted that Tardieu's edition includes some 220 pages of "Complements," including *errata*, *addenda*, indices *locorum*, *verborum*, *rerum*, an extremely useful concordance of the fragments, as well as the articles cited above by Dodds (n. 8) and Hadot (n. 6). See the review of G. Stroumsa, *Numen*, 27, 1981, pp. 167-172.

[120] See Dodds, "New Light," p. 265 = Lewy$^2$, p. 695, who rightly challenges several of Lewy's assumptions. The main objection to including the oracles from the *Theosophia* is that no ancient authority cites them (in part or whole) as belonging to the collection of the *Chaldean Oracles*. See, also, the introductory remarks to the Doubtful Fragments (*infra*, p. 217).

# TEXT AND TRANSLATION

## 1

(p. 11 Kr. = Damascius, I, 154, 14-26)

Μαρτυροῦνται δὲ οὖν καὶ οἱ αὐτοὶ (sc. ὁ Ἰάμβλιχος ἐν τοῖς Χαλδαϊκοῖς καὶ οἱ μετ' αὐτόν) τοὺς θεούς, ἐν οἷς ἔπεσι λέγουσι πρὸς τὸν θεουργόν·

''ἔστιν γάρ τι νοητόν, ὃ χρή σε νοεῖν νόου ἄνθει·
ἢν γὰρ ἐπεγκλίνῃς σὸν νοῦν κἀκεῖνο νοήσῃς
ὥς τι νοῶν, οὐ κεῖνο νοήσεις· ἔστι γὰρ ἀλκῆς
ἀμφιφαοῦς δύναμις νοεραῖς στράπτουσα τομαῖσιν.
οὐ δὴ χρὴ σφοδρότητι νοεῖν τὸ νοητὸν ἐκεῖνο
ἀλλὰ νόου ταναοῦ ταναῇ φλογὶ πάντα μετρούσῃ
πλὴν τὸ νοητὸν ἐκεῖνο· χρεὼ δὴ τοῦτο νοῆσαι
οὐχ ἀτενῶς, ἀλλ' ἀγνὸν ἀπόστροφον ὄμμα φέροντα
σῆς ψυχῆς τεῖναι κενεὸν νόον εἰς τὸ νοητόν,
ὄφρα μάθῃς τὸ νοητόν, ἐπεὶ νόου ἔξω ὑπάρχει.''

## 2

(p. 51 Kr. = Damascius, I, 155, 11-15)

''ἐσσάμενον πάντευχον ἀκμὴν φωτὸς κελάδοντος,
ἀλκῇ τριγλώχινι νόον ψυχήν θ' ὁπλίσαντα,
πᾶν τριάδος σύνθημα βαλεῖν φρενὶ μηδ' ἐπιφοιτᾶν
ἐμπυρίοις σποράδην ὀχετοῖς, ἀλλὰ στιβαρηδόν,''

φησὶ καὶ τὰ τοιαῦτα περὶ αὐτῆς ὁ χρησμῳδῶν θεός.

## 3

(p. 12 Kr. = Psellus, *P.G.*, 122, 1144 a 8-9)

''...ὁ πατὴρ ἥρπασσεν ἑαυτόν,
οὐδ' ἐν ἑῇ δυνάμει νοερᾷ κλείσας ἴδιον πῦρ.''

## 4

(p. 13 Kr. = Proclus, *In Alc.*, 37 [84, 12-14 Cr.] W.; cf. *Th. pl.*, 365, 3-4)

πανταχοῦ γὰρ ἡ δύναμις τὸ μέσον κεκλήρωται· καὶ ἐν μὲν τοῖς νοητοῖς συνάπτει τὸν πατέρα καὶ τὸν νοῦν,

''ἡ μὲν γὰρ δύναμις σὺν ἐκείνῳ, νοῦς δ' ἀπ' ἐκείνου.''

1

Moreover, (Iamblichus and his successors in their Commentaries on the *Chaldean Oracles*) invoke the gods as witnesses in those verses where they address the theurgist:

> "For there exists a certain Intelligible which you must perceive by the flower of mind. For if you should incline your mind toward it and perceive it as perceiving a specific thing, you would not perceive it. For it is the power of strength, visible all around, flashing with intellectual divisions. Therefore, you must not perceive that Intelligible violently but with the flame of mind completely extended which measures all things, except that Intelligible. You must not perceive it intently, but keeping the pure eye of your soul turned away, you should extend an empty mind toward the Intelligible in order to comprehend it, since it exists outside of (your) mind."

2

> "Arrayed from head to toe with a clamorous light, armed in mind and soul with a triple-barbed strength, you must cast into your imagination the entire token of the triad, and not go toward the empyrean channels in a scattered way, but with concentration."

And the oracle-giving god says such things about (intelligible knowledge).

3

> "...the Father snatched himself away, and did not enclose his own fire in his intellectual Power."

4

For everywhere Power has been assigned the middle place; and among the intelligibles, it connects the Father and Intellect:

> "For Power is with him, but Intellect is from him."

## 5

(p. 13 Kr. = Proclus, *In Tim.*, II, 57, 30-58, 3)

''...οὐ γὰρ ἐς ὕλην
πῦρ ἐπέκεινα τὸ πρώτον ἐὴν δύναμιν κατακλείει
ἔργοις ἀλλὰ νόῳ· νοῦ γὰρ νόος ἐστιν ὁ κόσμου
τεχνίτης πυρίου,''

φησὶ τὸ λόγιον.

## 6

(p. 22 Kr. = Simplicius, *In Aristotelis de caelo*, II, 1, p. 375, 18-22 Heiberg)

διακρίνων μὲν καὶ ἀνέχων (sc. Ἄτλας) τὸν οὐρανὸν ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς, ὡς μὴ ἐπισυγχεῖσθαι τὰ ἄνω τοῖς κάτω·

''ὡς γὰρ ὑπεζωκώς τίς ὑμὴν νοερὸς διακρίνει''

κατὰ τὸ λόγιον,

''πῦρ πρῶτον καὶ πῦρ ἕτερον σπεύδοντα μιγῆναι.''

## 7

(p. 14 Kr. = Psellus, *P.G.*, 122, 1140 c 10-11)

''πάντα γὰρ ἐξετέλεσσε πατὴρ καὶ νῷ παρέδωκε
δευτέρῳ, ὃν πρῶτον κλῃΐζετε πᾶν γένος ἀνδρῶν.''

## 8

(p. 14 Kr. = Proclus, *In Crat.*, 51, 26-30)

καὶ ἡ μυστικωτάτη παράδοσις καὶ αἱ παρὰ τῶν θεῶν φῆμαι λέγει ὡς

''...δυὰς παρὰ τῷδε κάθηται.''

καὶ φησίν·

''ἀμφότερον γὰρ ἔχει, νῷ μὲν κατέχειν τὰ νοητά,
αἴσθησιν δ' ἐπάγειν κόσμοις.''

## 9

(e Proclo, *In Parm.*, VII, ed. C. Steel, V. 2, p. 512, 89-94 = Klibansky-Labowsky, p. 58, 25-30; cf. H.D. Saffrey, *REA*, XXVII, 1981, p. 222)

Merito igitur neque nomen ipsi possibile adducere, tamquam adaptari potens; hoc itaque, quod ultra omnia et soli ''le unum'' potens efferibile fieri desiderantibus eloqui quod ineloquibile, non Plato solummodo, sed et dii appellaverunt sic. Ipsi enim sunt responsa dantes sic:

''omnia enim ex uno entia e converso ad unum vadentia secta sunt, sicut intellectualiter, in corpora multa.''

5

"For the First Transcendent Fire does not enclose its own Power in matter by means of works, but by Intellect. For Intellect derived from Intellect is the Craftsman of the fiery cosmos,"

says the oracle.

6

But (Atlas) holds up the sky and separates it from the earth, so that the things above are not confused with the things below:

"For as a girdling, intellectual membrane, he separates,"

according to the oracle,

"the first fire and the other fire which are eager to mingle."

7

"For the Father perfected all things and handed them over to the Second Intellect, which you—the entire human race—call the First Intellect."

8

And the most mystical tradition—the *Oracles* from the gods—says that

"...beside this one sits a Dyad."

And it says:

"For it has a double function: it both possesses the intelligibles in its mind and brings sense-perception to the worlds."

9

Rightly, then, it is impossible to attribute a name to (the One), as if a name were able to fit it. Thus, that which is beyond all things and can be indicated only by the term "the One" by those who desire to express the inexpressible, not only Plato alone but even the gods have spoken in this way. For the gods themselves give oracular responses as follows:

"For all things which issue from the One and, conversely, go back to the One, are divided, so to speak, intelligibly, into many bodies."

## 9a

(e Proclo, *In Parm.*, VII, ed. C. Steel, V. 2, p. 512, 94-97 = Klibansky-Labowsky, p. 58, 30-33; cf. Saffrey, *ibid.*)

et nobis consulentes seponere quidem anime multitudinem, intelligentiam autem nostram sursumducere et circumducere in unum (dicentes):

> "neque in tuo intellectu detinere multivarium aliud, sed anime noema in unum ampliare."

## 10

(p. 15 Kr. = Psellus, *P.G.*, 122, 1145 a 4)

"...εἰσὶν πάντα ἑνὸς πυρὸς ἐκγεγαῶτα."

## 11

(p. 15 Kr. = Proclus, *In Alc.*, p. 23 [51, 8-11 Cr.] W; cf. Proclus, *In Eucl.*, 98, 17 F.)

τριττῶν τοίνυν ἐν τοῖς νοητοῖς καὶ κρυφίοις θεοῖς ὑποστάσεων οὐσῶν καὶ τῆς μὲν πρώτης τῷ ἀγαθῷ χαρακτηριζομένης·

"τἀγαθὸν αὐτὸ νοοῦσα ὅπου πατρικὴ μονάς ἐστι,"

τὸ λόγιόν φησι.

## 12

(p. 15. Kr. = Damascius, II, 29, 15-18; cf. Proclus, *In Eucl.*, 99, 1-2 F.)

ὡς δὲ ἐν τούτῳ μένουσα (sc. ἡ ὁλότης) τῷ κινεῖσθαί τε καὶ ὁρμᾶν καὶ τετάσθαι πρὸς γέννησιν αἰῶν ἐστιν·

"...ταναὴ (γὰρ) μονάς ἐστιν ἢ δύο γεννᾷ"

(κατὰ τὸ λόγιον). Διὸ καὶ τὸ μένειν ἀεὶ τῇ ἀόκνῳ στροφάλιγγι πᾶσι χαρίζεται, κατὰ τὴν αὐτὴν χρησμῳδίαν.

## 13

(p. 15 Kr. = Psellus, *P.G.*, 122, 1145 d 7)

"οὐ γὰρ ἀπαὶ πατρικῆς ἀρχῆς ἀτελές τι τροχάζει."

## 14

(p. 15 Kr. = Psellus, *P.G.*, 122, 1141 d 6)

"πατὴρ οὐ φόβον ἐνθρῴσκει, πειθὼ δ' ἐπιχεύει."

### 9a

And (the gods) advise us to put aside the multiplicity in the soul and elevate our perceptive faculty and drive it toward the One:

> "And do not keep in your mind the multiform other," they say, "but extend the perceptive faculty in the soul toward the One."

### 10

> "...all things have been generated from One Fire."

### 11

Now among the intelligible and hidden gods three essential natures exist, and the first is characterized by the Good:

> "Perceiving the Good itself, where the Paternal Monad exists,"

says the oracle.

### 12

Since (the wholeness) which continues in this movement, desire, and tension towards generation is Eternity:

> "...for the Monad is extensible which generates duality,"

(according to the oracle). Therefore, all things are obliged to remain forever in ceaseless motion, according to this oracular tradition.

### 13

> "For nothing imperfect runs forth from the Paternal Principle."

### 14

> "The Father does not provoke fear, but imbues persuasion."

## 15

(p. 15 Kr. = Proclus, *In tem p.*, I, 27, 27-28, 2)

''πᾶς θεὸς ἀγαθός,'' καὶ τῶν λογίων τῷ ἀξιώματι μαρτυρούντων, ἐν οἷς αἰτιώμενα τὴν τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἀσέβειάν φησιν·

''οὐδ' ὅτι πᾶς ἀγαθὸς θεὸς εἰδότες· ἄ, ταλαεργοί,
νήψατε...''

## 16

(p. 16 Kr. = Proclus, *In Crat.*, 63, 25-26)

δηλαδὴ τὸν ὑπερουράνιον τόπον καὶ ὅσα

''...τῇ θεοθρέμμονι σιγῇ
τῶν πατέρων...''

## 17

(p. 19, n. 1 Kr. = Proclus, *In Tim.*, I, 18, 25)

''...τῷ δὲ νοοῦντι τροφὴ τὸ νοητόν''

κατὰ τὸ λόγιόν ἐστι.

## 18

(p. 18 Kr. = Proclus, *In Crat.*, 57, 25-26; cf. Damascius, II, 16, 6 [ὑπὲρ κόσμον] + 65, 16 [ὑπέρκοσμον])

''οἳ τὸν ὑπέρκοσμον πατρικὸν βυθὸν ἵστε νοοῦντες,''

λέγει πρὸς αὐτοὺς (sc. τοὺς νοεροὺς θεούς) ὁ ὕμνος.

## 19

(p. 19, n. 1 Kr. = Damascius, II, 16, 15-16)

εἴρηται γὰρ (παρ' αὐτῶν τῶν θεῶν)

''τόνδε νοεῖ πᾶς νοῦς θεόν...''

## 20

(p. 11 Kr. = Proclus, *In Tim.*, III, 102, 10-12; cf. Damascius, II, 16, 20-21; 57, 26-28)

''οὐ γὰρ ἄνευ νόος ἐστι νοητοῦ, καὶ τὸ νοητὸν
οὐ νοῦ χωρὶς ὑπάρχει...''

κατὰ τὸ λόγιον.

## 15

"Every god is good." The *Oracles* testify to this axiom in those verses where they blame the impiety of men and say:

> "And you do not know that every god is good. O, drudges, sober up..."

## 16

Clearly the transcendent place and all those things

> "...in the god-nourishing silence of the Fathers."

## 17

> "...for the one who has perception, the intelligible is nourishment,"

according to the oracle.

## 18

> "You (gods) who know the supermundane, Paternal Abyss by perceiving it,"

says the hymn about them (sc. the intellectual gods).

## 19

For it is said (among the gods themselves) that

> "every mind perceives this god..."

## 20

> "For Intellect does not exist without the intelligible, and the intelligible does not exist apart from Intellect..."

according to the oracle.

## 20 *bis*

(Damascius, II, 16, 18)

λέγεται γὰρ εἶναι (sc. ὁ πατήρ)

"...νοητόν, ἔξων τὸ νοοῦν ἐν ἑαυτῷ."

## 21

(p. 19 Kr. = Damascius, I, 147, 27-148, 1; cf. 153, 20; 235, 4; 275, 28)

"...πάντ' ἐστὶ γάρ, ἀλλὰ νοητῶς,"

φησὶ τὸ λόγιον.

## 22

(p. 18 + n. 1 Kr. = Proclus, *In Tim.*, III, 243, 16-21 + *In Parm.*, 1091, 6 + 8 Co.$^{2}$)

Οὕτω καὶ ἐν τοῖς λογίοις αἱ ἐνέργειαι τῶν θεῶν καὶ αὐτοῦ τοῦ πατρὸς ὑπ' αὐτῶν δηλοῦνται διὰ τοῦ εἰπεῖν, ὡς ὅταν λέγῃ·

"εἰς τρία γὰρ νοῦς εἶπε πατρὸς τέμνεσθαι ἅπαντα,
<πρωτίστου πατρὸς> ἀϊδίου νῷ πάντα κυβερνῶν·
οὗ τὸ θέλειν κατένευσε καὶ ἤδη πάντ' ἐτέτμητο."

## 23

(Didymus, *De Trinitate*, II, 27; *P.G.*, 39, 756 a)

(Εἰσὶν δὲ οἱ στίχοι χρησμοῦ οὕτως)·

"ὄφρα τὰ πάντα τριὰς συνέχῃ κατὰ πάντα μετροῦσα."

## 24

(p. 43 Kr. = Damascius, I, 291, 11-13)

καὶ τίς ἡ μέση δυάς; ἡ συνοχικὴ φύσις καὶ ἡ τελεταρχική, αὕτη μὲν διορίζουσα τὴν συνοχήν

"εἰς ἀρχὴν καὶ τέρμα καὶ εἰς μέσα τάξει ἀνάγκης."

## 25

(p. 46 Kr. = Proclus, *In Tim.*, III, 316, 9-10)

ὥσπερ δή φησι καὶ τὸ λόγιον·

"ταῦτα πατὴρ ἐνόησε, βροτὸς δέ οἱ ἐψύχωτο."

## 20 *bis*

For it is said that the Father is

> "...intelligible, having within himself that which thinks."

## 21

> "...for he is all things, but intelligibly,"

says the oracle.

## 22

Thus, in the *Oracles* as well, the actions of the gods and of the Father himself are revealed by them through speech, as when it says:

> "For the Intellect of the Father said for all things to separate into three, governing all things by the Intellect <of the very first> eternal <Father>. He nodded his assent to this and immediately all things were separated."

## 23

(The verses of the oracle are as follows):

> "In order that a triad might connect the All while measuring all things."

## 24

And what is the dyadic middle? It is the connective and teletarchic nature which separates the cohesion

> "into beginning, end, and middle in the order determined by Necessity."

## 25

Indeed, even as the oracle says:

> "The Father thought these things and a mortal was brought to life by him."

## 26*

(Lydus, *De mens.*, II, 6; 23, 10-12 W.)

πρὸς γὰρ τὸν ἅπαξ ἐπέκεινα ὁ Πρόκλος οὕτω·

"μουνάδα γάρ σε τριοῦχον ἰδὼν ἐσεβάσσατο κόσμος."

## 27

(p. 18 Kr. = Damascius, I, 87, 1-4; cf. II, 87, 14)

εἴτε πατήρ ἐστι καὶ δύναμις καὶ νοῦς, εἴη ἂν τὸ πρὸ τούτων, ὁ εἷς πατὴρ ὁ πρὸ τῆς τριάδος·

"παντὶ γὰρ ἐν κόσμῳ λάμπει τριάς, ἧς μονὰς ἄρχει,"

φησὶ τὸ λόγιον.

## 28

(p. 18 Kr. = Lydus, *De mens.*, II, 8; p. 28, 1-5 W.)

πάντα γὰρ τὰ νοητὰ ἐν τῇ τριάδι περιέχεται καὶ πᾶς ὁ θεῖος ἀριθμὸς ἐν τῇ τάξει ταύτῃ προελήλυθεν, ὡς καὶ αὐτὸς ὁ Χαλδαῖος ἐν τοῖς λογίοις·

"τῆσδε γὰρ ἐκ τριάδος κόλποις ἔσπαρται ἅπαντα."

## 29

(p. 18 Kr. = Lydus, *De mens.*, II, 8; p. 28, 6-7 W.)

καὶ πάλιν·

"τῆσδε γὰρ ἐκ τριὰδος πᾶν πνεῦμα πατὴρ ἐκέρασσεν."

## 30

(p. 19 Kr. = Damascius, II, 67, 1-3)

Διόπερ οὐδὲ πηγὴ μία τῶν πολλῶν αὕτη γε, ἀλλὰ

"πηγὴ τῶν πηγῶν"

καὶ πηγῶν ἁπασῶν, κατὰ τὸ λόγιον,

"μήτρα συνέχουσα τὰ πάντα."

## 31

(p. 15 Kr. = Damascius, II, 63, 20-23)

ἡ τρίτη τάξις ἀπὸ τῆς πρώτης καὶ τῆς δευτέρας ὁμοῦ πρόεισιν·

"ἐξ ἀμφοῖν δὴ τῶνδε ῥέει τριάδος δέμα πρώτης
οὔσης οὐ πρώτης, ἀλλ' οὗ τὰ νοητὰ μετρεῖται."

## 26*

For Proclus speaks in this way concerning the Once Transcendent:

> "For the world, seeing you as a triadic Monad, has honored you."

## 27

Whether there is Father, Power, and Intellect, there would be that which is before these, the Single Father, who is prior to the triad:

> "For in every world shines a triad, ruled by a Monad,"

says the oracle.

## 28

For all the intelligibles are enclosed in the triad, and every divine number comes forth in this order, as even the Chaldean himself says in the *Oracles*:

> "For in the womb of this triad all things are sown."

## 29
## (continues fr. 28)

And again:

> "For in this triad the Father has mixed every breath."

## 30

Therefore, this is not one source of many things, but

> "Source of Sources,"

and of all sources, according to the oracle,

> "the womb which contains the All."

## 31

The third order proceeds at the same time from the first and second order:

> "From both of these flows the bond of the first triad, which is not truly first, but where the intelligibles are measured."

## 32

(p. 19 Kr. = Proclus, *In Tim.*, I, 420, 11-16)

Ἡ τρίτη τοίνυν τριὰς ἡ νοητὴ τὸ αὐτοζῷον, περὶ ἧς καὶ τὰ λόγιά φησιν, ὅτι

''ἐργάτις (ὅτι) ἐκδότις ἐστὶ πυρὸς ζωηφόρου <αὕτη>,
(ὅτι) καὶ τὸν ζῳογόνον πληροῦσ' Ἑκάτης ⏑ ⏑ κόλπον
(καὶ).....ἐπιρρεῖ τοῖς συνοχεῦσιν
ἀλκὴν ζειδώροιο πυρὸς μέγα δυναμένοιο.''

## 33

(p. 19 Kr. = Proclus, *In Tim.*, I, 12, 16-19)

ἡ μὲν οὖν ἐν τῷ δημιουργῷ τέχνη μένει τε ἐν αὐτῷ καὶ αὐτός ἐστι, καθ' ἣν καὶ

''...ἐργοτεχνίτης,''

ὑπὸ τῶν λογίων ἐπονομάζεται καὶ

''κόσμου τεχνίτης πυρίου...''

## 34

(p. 20 Kr. = Proclus, *In Tim.*, I, 451, 17-22)

οὕτω δὲ καὶ τὰ λόγια τὸν μέγιστον τοῦτον θεὸν ''πηγὴν πηγῶν'' προσαγορεύει καὶ μόνον ἀπογεννῆσαι τὰ πάντα φησίν·

''ἔνθεν ἀποθρῴσκει γένεσις πολυποικίλου ὕλης·
ἔνθεν συρόμενος πρηστὴρ ἀμυδροῖ πυρὸς ἄνθος
κόσμων ἐνθρῴσκων κοιλώμασι· πάντα γὰρ ἔνθεν
ἄρχεται εἰς τὸ κάτω τείνειν ἀκτῖνας ἀγητάς.''

## 35

(p. 20 Kr. = Damascius, II, 133, 1-6; cf. Proclus, *In Crat.*, 58, 19-22)

ἤδη δὲ καὶ αὐτοῖς τοῖς θεοῖς πρῶτος ''ὁ ἅπαξ ἐπέκεινα'' τὴν ἑβδομάδα προβάλλεται· τοῖς δὲ ἄλλοις, ἀπὸ τούτου κατὰ μέθεξιν·

''τοῦδε γὰρ ἐκθρῴσκουσιν ἀμείλικτοί τε κεραυνοὶ
καὶ πρηστηροδόχοι κόλποι παμφεγγέος αὐγῆς
πατρογενοῦς Ἑκάτης καὶ ὑπεζωκὸς πυρὸς ἄνθος
ἠδὲ κραταιὸν πνεῦμα πόλων πυρίων ἐπέκεινα.''

## 32

Now the third intelligible triad is self-generated, about which even the *Oracles* say that

> "it is a worker, (that) it is the dispenser of life-giving fire, (that) it fills up the life-giving womb of Hecate (and)...pours on the Connectors a force of fruitful and very powerful fire."

## 33

Thus, the skill which exists in the Demiurge both remains within him and is himself, according to which he is called

> "...skilled worker"

by the *Oracles*, and

> "Craftsman of the fiery cosmos..."

## 34

Thus, the *Oracles* also call this very great god "Source of Sources," and say that he alone generated the All:

> "From there (i.e., "Source of Sources"), the birth of variegated matter leaps forth. From there, a lightning-bolt, sweeping along, obscures the flower of fire as it leaps into the hollows of the worlds. For from there, all things begin to extend wonderful rays down below."

## 35

Indeed, the First Once Transcendent communicates the hebdomad to the gods themselves; but to others, it is communicated by him through participation:

> "For Implacable Thunders leap from him and the lightning-receiving womb of the shining ray of Hecate, who is generated from the Father. From him leap the girdling flower of fire and the powerful breath (situated) beyond the fiery poles."

## 36

(p. 21 Kr. = Proclus, *In Crat.*, p. 58, 11-15)

διὸ καὶ ἐν τοῖς λογίοις τὴν πρωτίστην πηγὴν τῶν ἀμειλίκτων λέγεται περιέχειν, ''ἐποχεῖσθαι'' δὲ τοῖς ἄλλοις ἅπασιν·

''νοῦς πατρὸς ἀρράτοις ἐποχούμενος ἰθυντῆρσιν,
ἄγναμπτον στράπτουσιν ἀμειλίκτου πυρὸς ὁλκοῖς.''

## 37

(pp. 23-24 Kr. = Proclus, *In Parm.*, 800, 18-801, 5 Co.$^2$)

καὶ αὐτῶν μνησθῆναι τῶν ἐν τοῖς Χαλδαικοῖς λογίοις κειμένων·

''νοῦς πατρὸς ἐρροίζησε νοήσας ἀκμάδι βουλῇ
παμμόρφους ἰδέας, πηγῆς δὲ μιᾶς ἅπο πᾶσαι
ἐξέθορον· πατρόθεν γὰρ ἔην βουλή τε τέλος τε.
ἀλλ' ἐμερίσθησαν νοερῷ πυρὶ μοιρηθεῖσαι
εἰς ἄλλας νοεράς· κόσμῳ γὰρ ἄναξ πολυμόρφῳ
προὔθηκεν νοερὸν τύπον ἄφθιτον, οὗ κατ' ἄκοσμον
ἴχνος ἐπειγόμενος μορφῆς μέτα κόσμος ἐφάνθη
παντοίαις ἰδέαις κεχαραγμένος· ὧν μία πηγή,
ἐξ ἧς ῥοιζοῦνται μεμερισμέναι ἄλλαι ἄπλατοι
ῥηγνύμεναι κόσμου περὶ σώμασιν, αἳ περὶ κόλπους
σμερδαλέους σμήνεσσιν ἐοικυῖαι φορέονται
στράπτουσαι περὶ τ' ἀμφὶ παρασχεδὸν ἄλλυδις ἄλλῃ,
ἔννοιαι νοεραὶ πηγῆς πατρικῆς ἄπο, πουλὺ
δρεπτόμεναι πυρὸς ἄνθος ἀκοιμήτου χρόνου ἀκμῇ.
ἀρχεγόνους ἰδέας πρώτη πατρὸς ἔβλυσε τάσδε
αὐτοτελὴς πηγή.''

## 38

(p. 24 Kr. = Proclus, *In Parm.*, 895, 7-12 Co.$^2$)

τὰς γοῦν ἐν ἐκείνῳ (sc. τῷ πατρικῷ νοῷ) πρώτως ὑφεστώσας ἰδέας ἡμῖν ἑρμηνεύοντα τὰ λόγια κέκληκεν αὐτὰς ''ἐννοίας πατρικάς''...

''ἔννοιαι πατρὸς αἵδε, μεθ' ἃς ἐμὸν εἰλυμένον πῦρ.''

## 39

(p. 25 Kr. = Proclus, *In Tim.*, II, 54, 5-16)

τοῦτον δὲ τὸν μέγιστον καὶ τελεώτατον δεσμὸν ὃν περιβάλλει τῷ κοσμῷ πανταχόθεν ὁ πατὴρ...''δεσμὸν πυριβριθῆ ἔρωτος'' τὰ λόγια προσείρηκεν·

''ἔργα νοήσας γὰρ πατρικὸς νόος αὐτογένεθλος
πᾶσιν ἐνέσπειρεν δεσμὸν πυριβριθῆ ἔρωτος.''

## 36

Therefore, even in the *Oracles* it is said that the Very First Source encloses the Implacables but "rides upon" all others:

> "The Intellect of the Father rides upon the unshakeable guides which shine inflexibly by the furrows of the Implacable Fire."

## 37

And (we must) recall the very (words) which are found in the *Chaldean Oracles*:

> "The Intellect of the Father, while thinking with its vigorous will, shot forth the multiformed Ideas. All these leapt forth from one Source, for from the Father comes both will and perfection. But the Ideas were divided by the Intelligible Fire and allotted to other intelligibles. For the Ruler placed before the multiformed cosmos an intelligible and imperishable model from which, along a disorderly track, the world with its form hastened to appear, engraved with multiform Ideas. There is one Source for these, from which other terrible (Ideas), divided, shoot forth, breaking themselves on the bodies of the worlds. Those which are borne around the frightful wombs like a swarm of bees—flashing here and there in various directions—are the intelligible Thoughts from the Paternal Source, which pluck in abundance the flower of fire from the acme of sleepless Time. The first self-perfected Source of the Father spouted forth these primordial Ideas."

## 38

At any rate, the *Oracles*, explaining to us the Ideas which exist primarily in (the Paternal Intellect), have called them "Paternal Thoughts:"

> "These are the Thoughts of the Father, after which my fire is rolled up."

## 39

But this greatest and most perfect bond which the Father everywhere throws around the world...the *Oracles* have called "bond of Love, heavy with fire:"

> "For after he thought his works, the self-generated Paternal Intellect sowed the bond of Love, heavy with fire, into all things."

καὶ τὴν αἰτίαν προσέθηκεν·

''ὄφρα τὰ πάντα μένῃ χρόνον εἰς ἀπέραντον ἐρῶντα,
μηδὲ πέσῃ τὰ πατρὸς νοερῷ ὑφασμένα φέγγει.''

διὰ γὰρ τοῦτον τὸν ἔρωτα πάντα ἥρμοσται ἀλλήλοις·

''ᾧ σὺν ἔρωτι μένει κόσμου στοιχεῖα θέοντα.''

## 40

(p. 37 Kr. = Damascius, II, 200, 21-24)

ὁρμηθέντες...σαφῶς δὲ καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν λογίων· εἴρηται γὰρ

''ἀρχάς, αἳ πατρὸς ἔργα νοήσασαι τὰ νοητὰ
αἰσθητοῖς ἔργοις καὶ σώμασιν ἀμφεκάλυψαν.''

## 41

(p. 65 Kr. = Proclus, *In Tim.*, II, 300, 10-14)

ἔτι δὲ τὸ ''ἐφάπτεσθαι'' πρεπόντως εἴρηται, διότι προσεχῶς ἡ ψυχὴ καὶ ἐφέστηκε τοῖς αἰσθητοῖς καὶ ἐξήρτηται τῶν νοητῶν, τῆς ἐπαφῆς τὴν ἐναργῆ καὶ ἄμεσον καὶ κατ' ἐπιβολὴν ὡρισμένην ἐστῶσαν γνῶσιν δηλούσης καὶ

''...ταἰσθητὰ νοούσης/ὡς ἐπαφητά,''

φησί τις θεῶν.

## 42

(p. 25 Kr. = Proclus, *In Parm.*, 769, 7-12 Co.[2])

Διακέκριται ἅμα καὶ συγκέκριται (sc. τὰ εἴδη τὰ νοητά) (κατὰ τὸ λόγιον)

''δεσμῷ ἔρωτος ἀγητοῦ, ὃς ἐκ νόου ἔκθορε πρῶτος,
ἐσσάμενος πυρὶ πῦρ συνδέσμιον, ὄφρα κεράσσῃ
πηγαίους κρατῆρας ἑοῦ πυρὸς ἄνθος ἐπισχών.''

## 43

(p. 26 Kr. = Proclus, *Th. pl.*, I, 2; 11, 13-14 S.-W.)

''...ἔρωτι (μὲν) βαθεῖ...''

κατὰ τὸ λόγιον ἀναπλήσας τὴν ψυχήν.

And the *Oracles* add the reason for this:

> "In order that the All might continue to love for an infinite time and the things woven by the intellectual light of the Father might not collapse."

Because of this Love, all things are suited to one another:

> "With this Love, the elements of the world remain on course."

## 40

Inspired...clearly by the *Oracles*; for it is said that

> "the Principles, which perceived the intelligible works of the Father, concealed them with sense-perceptible works and bodies."

## 41

Further, "to touch" is suitably stated, because of the proximate way the Soul presides over sense-perceptibles and is dependent on intelligibles, with the contact revealing a knowledge which is clear, immediate, and established according to a definite intuition, and

> "...perceiving sense-perceptibles as capable of being touched,"

says one of the gods.

## 42

(The intelligible Ideas) are separated and compounded at the same time (according to the oracle)

> "by the bond of wondrous Love, which leapt first from Intellect, clothing his bonded fire with the fire (of Intellect) in order to mingle the Source Craters while offering the flower of his fire."

## 43

Having filled the soul

> "...with a deep Love..."

according to the oracle.

## 44

(p. 26 Kr. = Lydus, *De mens.*, I, 11; 3, 12-16 W. + Schol. *Paris. gr.* 1853, f. 312 r°)

τὸ λόγιον ὁλὴν τὴν ψυχὴν τριάδα θείαν παραδίδωσι (sc. οἱ Χαλδαῖοι)· φησὶ γὰρ ὁ αὐτὸς (sc. ὁ Χαλδαῖος)·

''...ψυχαῖον σπινθῆρα δυσὶν κράσας ὁμονοίαις,
νῷ καὶ νεύματι θείῳ, ἐφ' οἷς τρίτον ἁγνὸν ἔρωτα,
συνδετικὸν πάντων ἐπιβήτορα σεμνόν, ἔθηκεν.''

## 45

(p. 26 Kr. = Proclus, *In rem p.*, I, 176, 22-23; cf. II, 347, 8; *In Alc.*, 53 [117, 17 Cr.] W.)

οἱ θεοὶ

''...πνιγμὸν ἔρωτος ἀληθοῦς''

προσειρήκασιν (sc. τὸν ὑβριστὴν ἔρωτα).

## 46

(p. 26 Kr. = Proclus, *In Tim.*, I, 212, 19-22)

(δεῖ)...ἀρετάς τε ἀπὸ τῆς γενέσεως καθαρτικὰς καὶ ἀναγωγοὺς προβεβλῆσθαι καὶ

''...πίστιν κἀλήθειαν καὶ ἔρωτα,''

ταύτην ἐκείνην τὴν τριάδα.

## 47

(p. 26, n. 2 Kr. = Olympiodorus, *In Phaedonem*, 105 [39, 11-15 N.] W.; cf. 111 [42, 7 N.] W.)

Ἐλπίδα...τὴν θείαν καὶ ἀπὸ νοῦ κατιοῦσαν καὶ βεβαίαν, περὶ ἧς τὸ λόγιον ἔφη·

''ἐλπὶς δὲ τρεφέτω σε πυρήοχος...''

## 48

(p. 26 Kr. = Proclus, *In Alc.*, 23 [52, 13-14; 53, 1-2 Cr.] W.)

''πάντα γὰρ ἐν τρισὶ τοῖσδε κυβερνᾶταί τε καὶ ἔστι''

(φησὶ τὸ λόγιον). καὶ διὰ τοῦτο καὶ τοῖς θεουργοῖς οἱ θεοὶ παρακελεύονται διὰ τῆς τριάδος ταύτης ἑαυτοὺς τῷ θεῷ συνάπτειν.

## 44

(The Chaldeans) hand down an oracle concerning the entire soul as a divine triad. For (the Chaldean) himself says:

> "(The Father) mixed the spark of soul with two harmonious qualities, Intellect and divine Will, to which he added a third, pure Love, as the guide and holy bond of all things."

## 45

The gods have termed (wanton love)

> "...a stifling of true Love."

## 46

(It is necessary)...to propose the virtues which, from creation, purify and lead back (to God),

> "...Faith, Truth, and Love,"

that praiseworthy triad.

## 47

Divine Hope, which descends from Intellect and is certain, concerning which the oracle says:

> "May fire-bearing Hope nourish you..."

## 48

> "For all things are governed and exist in these three (virtues),"

(says the oracle). For this reason, the gods counsel the theurgists to unite themselves with God by means of this triad.

## 49

(p. 27 + n. 1 Kr. = Proclus, *In Tim.*, III, 14, 3-10)

Διὸ καὶ ὑπὸ τῶν λογίων ''πατρογενὲς φάος'' εἴρηται (sc. ἡ τάξις τοῦ αἰῶνος), διότι δὴ τὸ ἑνοποιὸν φῶς πᾶσιν ἐπιλάμπει·

''...πολὺ γὰρ μόνος ἐκ πατρὸς ἀλκῆς
δρεψάμενος νόου ἄνθος ἔχει τὸ νοεῖν πατρικὸν νοῦν
<καὶ νόον> ἐνδιδόναι πάσαις πηγαῖς τε καὶ ἀρχαῖς
καὶ δινεῖν αἰεί τε μένειν ἀόκνῳ στροφάλιγγι.''

## 50

(p. 27 Kr. = Damascius, II, 164, 18-19)

λέγεται ὑπὸ τῶν θεῶν

''μέσσον τῶν πατέρων Ἑκάτης κέντρον πεφορῆσθαι.''

## 51

(p. 28 Kr. = Proclus, *In rem p.*, II, 201, 10-16)

τοῦτό μοι δοκεῖ καὶ τὰ λόγια λέγειν τὸ φῶς, ἡνίκα ἂν διδάσκοντα περὶ τῆς ψυχώσεως, ἣν ἡ πηγὴ τῶν ψυχῶν τὰ πάντα ψυχοῖ. λέγῃ·

''δεξιτερῆς μὲν γὰρ λαγόνος περὶ χήραμα χόνδρων
πολλὴ ἄδην βλύζει ψυχῆς λιβὰς ἀρχιγενέθλου
ἄρδην ἐμψυχοῦσα φάος πῦρ αἰθέρα κόσμους.''

## 52

(p. 28 Kr. = Psellus, *P.G.*, 122, 1136 a 11-12)

''λαιῆς ἐν λαγόσιν Ἑκάτης ἀρετῆς πέλε πηγή,
ἔνδον ὅλη μίμνουσα τὸ παρθένον οὐ προϊεῖσα.''

## 53

(p. 28 Kr. = Proclus, *In Tim.*, II, 61, 22-25; cf. I, 408, 16-17)

οὕτω δὴ καὶ τὰ λόγια τὰς μεριστὰς τοῦ δημιουργοῦ νοήσεις ''διανοίας'' προσείρηκε·

''...μετὰ δὴ πατρικὰς διανοίας
ψυχὴ ἐγὼ ναίω θέρμῃ ψυχοῦσα τὰ πάντα.''

## 49

Therefore, (the order of Eternity) is said to be "Father-begotten light" by the *Oracles* since, indeed, unifying light shines upon all things:

> "For (Aion) alone, copiously plucking the flower of mind from the strength of the Father, has the power to perceive the Paternal Intellect <and> to impart <Intellect> to all Sources and Principles, and to whirl them about and keep them forever in ceaseless motion."

## 50

It is said by the gods that

> "the center of Hecate is borne in the midst of the Fathers."

## 51

It seems to me that the *Oracles* also speak about this light, when giving instructions concerning the principle of life by which the source of souls animates the All. It says:

> "Around the hollow of her right flank a great stream of the primordially-generated Soul gushes forth in abundance, totally ensouling light, fire, ether, worlds."

## 52

> "In the left flank of Hecate exists the source of virtue, which remains entirely within and does not give up its virginity."

## 53

Thus, even the *Oracles* call the divisible perceptions of the Demiurge "Thoughts:"

> "...after the Paternal Thoughts I, the Soul, am situated, animating the All with my heat."

## 54

(p. 29 Kr. = Proclus, *In Parm.*, 821, 5-7 Co.$^2$; cf. *In rem p.*, II, 150, 21; *In Tim.*, I, 11, 21 + III, 271, 11)

θεολόγοι δὲ καὶ πηγὴν αὐτῆς (sc. τῆς φύσεως) ἐν τῇ ζῳογόνῳ ὑπέστησαν θεῷ·

''νώτοις δ' ἀμφὶ θεᾶς φύσις ἄπλετος ᾐώρηται.''

## 55

(p. 29 Kr. = Proclus, *In rem p.*, I, 137, 21-23)

''χαῖται μὲν γὰρ ἐς ὀξὺ πεφρικότι φωτὶ βλέπονται,''

φησίν τις θεῶν.

## 56

(p. 30 Kr. = Proclus, *In Crat.*, p. 81, 2-8)

περὶ δὲ τῆς ζῳογόνου πηγῆς Ῥέας, ἐξ ἧς πᾶσα ζωὴ θεία τε καὶ νοερὰ καὶ ψυχικὴ καὶ ἐγκόσμιος ἀπογεννᾶται, οὕτως φασὶν τὰ λόγια·

'''Ῥείη τοι νοερῶν μακάρων πηγή τε ῥοή τε·
πάντων γὰρ πρώτη δυνάμει κόλποισιν ἀφράστοις
δεξαμένη γενεὴν ἐπὶ πᾶν προχέει τροχάουσαν.''

## 57

(p. 31 Kr. = Simplicius, *In Phys.*, 616, 33-35; cf. 615, 13; 623, 34)

πῶς οὖν τὰ λόγιά φησιν·

''ἑπτὰ γὰρ ἐξώγκωσε πατὴρ στερεώματα κόσμων.''

## 58

(Proclus, *In rem p.*, II, 220, 11-18)

ἀλλὰ τῶν παρὰ Χαλδαίοις θεουργῶν ἀκούσας, ὡς ἄρα ὁ θεὸς ἐμεσεμβόλησεν τὸν ἥλιον ἐν τοῖς ἑπτὰ καὶ ἀνεκρέμασεν ἀπ' αὐτοῦ τὰς ἓξ ἄλλας ζώνας, καὶ τῶν θεῶν αὐτῶν ὅτι τὸ ἡλιακὸν πῦρ

''...κραδίης τόπῳ ἐστήριξεν...''

ἕπομαι μὲν τοῖς ἐκ τῶν θεῶν πεφασμένοις.

### 54

But even the theologians suppose that the source (of Nature) is in the generative goddess:

> "On the back of the goddess boundless Nature is suspended."

### 55

> "For her hair appears dazzlingly in shimmering light,"

says one of the gods.

### 56

Concerning Rhea, the generative source, from whom all divine life— intellectual, spiritual, and mundane—is generated, the *Oracles* speak as follows:

> "Truly Rhea is the source and stream of blessed intellectual (realities). For she, first in power, receives the birth of all these in her inexpressible womb and pours forth (this birth) on the All as it runs its course."

### 57

How then do the *Oracles* say it:

> "For the Father has inflated the seven firmaments of the worlds."

### 58

But having heard from the Chaldean theurgists that God intercalated the sun among the seven (zones) and made the six other zones dependent upon it, and having heard from the gods themselves that the solar fire

> "...was established at the site of the heart..."

I follow what has been revealed by the gods.

## 59

(p. 33 Kr. = Proclus, *In Tim.*, III, 83, 13-16)

καὶ οἵ γε μυστικώτατοι τῶν λόγων καὶ ''τὴν ὁλότητα'' αὐτοῦ τὴν ἐν τοῖς ὑπερκοσμίοις παραδεδώκασιν· ἐκεῖ γὰρ

''(ὁ) ἡλιακὸς κόσμος (καὶ τὸ) ὅλον φῶς...''

ὡς αἵ τε Χαλδαίων φῆμαι λέγουσι καὶ ἐγὼ πείθομαι.

## 60

(p. 33 Kr. = Proclus, *In Tim.*, II, 9, 16-18)

καὶ τῶν θεολόγων ἀκούων

''πῦρ πυρὸς ἐξοχέτευμα...''

τὸν ἥλιον καλούντων

''καὶ ταμίαν πυρός...''

καὶ πᾶσι τοῖς τοιούτοις ὀνόμασι.

## 61

(pp. 33-34 + 47 Kr. = Proclus, *In Tim.*, III, 61, 8-25 + 234, 28-30 = vv. 14-15)

καὶ τῶν λογίων...πανταχοῦ μετὰ τὸν ἥλιον τὴν σελήνην ταττόντων καὶ μετὰ τὴν σελήνην τὸν ἀέρα...

''αἰθέριός τε δρόμος καὶ μήνης ἄπλετος ὁρμή,''

φησίν,

''ἠέριοί τε ῥοαί...''

καὶ πάλιν·

''αἰθήρ, ἥλιε, πνεῦμα σελήνης, ἠέρος ἀγοί.''

καὶ ἐν ἄλλοις·

''ἡλιακῶν τε κύκλων καὶ μηναίων καναχισμῶν
κόλπων τ' ἠερίων...''

καὶ ἑξῆς·

''...αἴθρης μέρος ἠελίου τε
καὶ μήνης ὀχετῶν ἠδ' ἠέρος...
αἴθρης {μέρος} ἠελίου τε σεληναίης τε καὶ ὅσ<σ>α
ἠέρι συννήχονται...''

καὶ ἀλλαχοῦ·

''...καὶ πλατὺς ἀὴρ
μηναῖός τε δρόμος καὶ ἀείπολος ἠελίοιο.''

## 59

And indeed the most mystical doctrines hand down that this "wholeness" exists in the supermundane (worlds); for there exists the

> "solar world (and the) whole light..."

as the *Chaldean Oracles* say and which I believe.

## 60

And I hear the theologians call the sun

> "fire, channel of fire...
> and dispenser of fire..."

and all such names.

## 61

And the *Oracles*...everywhere place the moon after the sun and the air after the moon:

a). "The ethereal course and the boundless impulse of the moon,"

they say,

b). "and airy streams..."

And again:

c). "Ether, sun, breath of moon, airy leaders."

And in other (verses):

d). "Of solar circles and lunar soundings and airy hollows..."

And next:

e). "...portion of ether and sun and channels of moon and air..."

f). "[Portion] of ether, sun, and moon and all those things which swim with the air..."

And elsewhere:

g). "...and expansive air, the course of the moon and the eternal orbit of the sun."

## 62

(p. 34 Kr. = Damascius, *In Phaedonem*, 359 (239, 3-4 N.) W.)

ἁπλῶς δ' οὖν οἱ

''τῶν στοιχείων αἰθέρες...''

ὥς φησι τὰ λόγια, ἐκεῖ.

## 63

(p. 34 Kr. = Damascius, II, 128, 3-5)

καὶ οἱ θεοὶ ἐν τοῖς λογίοις

''κυρτῷ σχήματι συρομένην...''

παραδεδώκασι μίαν γραμμήν, καὶ πολλὴ τοῦ γραμμιαίου σχήματος παρ' αὐτοῖς ἡ χρῆσις.

## 64

(p. 34 Kr. = Proclus, *In Tim.*, III, 124, 26-29)

καὶ γὰρ τὰ λόγια τῶν ἀστέρων τὸ προπόρευμα τῶν ἀπλανῶν οὐχ ἅπαξ, ἀλλὰ καὶ πολλάκις λέγοντα·

''μηναῖόν τε δρόμημα καὶ ἀστέριον προπόρευμα.''

## 65

(p. 35 Kr. = Proclus, *In Tim.*, II, 107, 6-11)

μέχρι γὰρ τοῦ κέντρου πρόεισιν ὁ τῆς ζῳογονίας ὀχετός, ὡς καὶ τὰ λόγιά φησι, διαλεγόμενα περὶ τοῦ μέσου τῶν πέντε κέντρων ἄνωθεν διήκοντος διαμπὰξ ἐπὶ τὸ καταντικρὺ διὰ τοῦ κέντρου τῆς γῆς·

''καὶ πέμπτον μέσον ἄλλο πυρήοχον, ἔνθα κάτεισι
μέχρι <καὶ> ὑλαίων ὀχετῶν ζωηφόριον πῦρ.''

## 66

(p. 55 Kr. = Proclus, *In rem p.*, I, 178, 17-20)

''μιγνυμένων δ' ὀχετῶν πυρὸς ἀφθίτου ἔργα τελοῦσα''

(sc. ἡ ἀκροτάτη ζωή) κατὰ τὸ λόγιον, ἕνα δὲ σύνδεσμον θεῖον ἀπεργαζομένη τοῦ μετεχομένου καὶ μετέχοντος καὶ σύγκρασιν ἑνοποιόν.

## 62

Plainly, therefore, the

> "ethers of the elements..."

as the *Oracles* say, are there.

## 63

And the gods in the *Oracles* have taught us that a single line is

> "drawn in a curved shape..."

and they make a great use of linear shape.

## 64

For even the *Oracles*, not once but often, speak of the procession of the fixed stars:

> "The lunar course and starry procession."

## 65

For the generative channel proceeds up until the center, as even the *Oracles* say when speaking about the middle of the five centers, which extends from on high straight through to the opposite side via the center of the earth:

> "And there is a fifth in the middle, another channel of fire, where the life-bearing fire descends as far as the material channels."

## 66

> "As the channels are mingled together (the highest life) perfects the works of imperishable fire,"

according to the oracle, and produces a single, divine bond and a unifying blend of participated and participant.

## 67

(p. 35 Kr. = Proclus, *In Tim.*, II, 50, 20-23)

καὶ μὴν καὶ ἡ τῶν Ἀσσυρίων θεολογία τὰ αὐτὰ παραδίδωσι θεόθεν ἐκφανθέντα· καὶ γὰρ ἐν ἐκείνῃ ὁ δημιουργὸς τὸν ὅλον κόσμον λέγεται ποιεῖν

"ἐκ πυρός, ἐξ ὕδατος καὶ γῆς καὶ παντρόφου αἴθρης."

## 68

(p. 35 Kr. = Proclus, *In Tim.*, II, 50, 24-27)

καὶ ὁ ποιητὴς ὡς αὐτουργῶν (sc. λέγεται) τεκταίνεσθαι τὸν κόσμον·

"καὶ γὰρ <ὅ>τις πυρὸς ὄγκος ἔην ἕτερος, τὰ δὲ πάντα
αὐτουργῶν ἵνα σῶμα τὸ κοσμικὸν ἐκτολυπευθῇ,
κόσμος ἵν' ἔκδηλος καὶ μὴ φαίνηθ' ὑμενώδης."

## 69

(p. 35 Kr. = Proclus, *In Tim.*, I, 286, 8-13)

(ὁ οὐρανός) ἔστι δὲ ἁπλῶς καὶ σῶμα ἔχων...καὶ τούτῳ πάλιν ἐκεῖνο τὸ λόγιον εἴρηται συμφώνως·

"νοῦ μὲν γὰρ μίμημα πέλει, τὸ δὲ τευχθὲν ἔχει τι
σώματος."

## 70

(p. 36 Kr. = Damascius, II, 157, 15-20)

τὰ δὲ λόγια ἁπλῶς φύσιν λέγει τὴν διὰ παντῶν χωροῦσαν ἁπηωρῆσθαι τῆς μεγάλης Ἑκάτης...

"ἄρχει γὰρ φύσις ἀκαμάτη κόσμων τε καὶ ἔργων,
οὐρανὸς ὄφρα θέῃ δρόμον ἀΐδιον κατασύρων,
καὶ ταχὺς ἠέλιος περὶ κέντρον ὅπως ἐθὰς ἔλθῃ."

## 71

(p. 36 Kr. = Proclus, *In Crat.*, 98, 14-15)

(Ἀπόλλων)...

"ἁρμονίᾳ φωτὸς γαυρούμενος..."

ὥς φησί τις τῶν θεουργῶν.

## 67

Moreover, the theology of the Assyrians teaches the same doctrines, which were revealed to them by the gods. For in that theology, the Demiurge is said to have made the entire world

> "from fire, water, earth, and all-nourishing air."

## 68

And the Maker, while working with his own hands, (is said) to fashion the world:

> "For whatever other mass of fire there was, the All he worked with his own hands, so that the world-body might be fully completed and the world might be visible and not seem membrane-like."

## 69

(The sky), quite clearly, is said to have a body...and with this (position), again this oracle is in agreement:

> "For (the sky) is an imitation of Intellect, but the product has something of the corporeal in it."

## 70

But the *Oracles* plainly state that Nature, advancing through all things, is suspended from the great Hecate...

> "For untiring Nature rules both worlds and works, in order that the sky might turn round, pulling down its eternal course, and that the swift sun might come around the center, just as it is accustomed to do."

## 71

(Apollo)...

> "priding himself on the harmony of light..."

as one of the theurgists says.

## 72

(p. 36 Kr. = Proclus, *Th. pl.*, 324, 3-8 Portus)

καί μοι δοκεῖ διὰ τούτων πάλιν ὁ Πλάτων τὰ αὐτὰ λέγειν ὕστερον τοῖς ὑπὸ τῶν θεῶν πεφασμένοις, καὶ ἣν ἐκεῖνοι ''πάντευχον'' προσειρήκασι, ταύτην πανοπλίᾳ παντελεῖ κεκοσμημένην εὐφημεῖν·

''καὶ γὰρ δὴ πάντευχος ἐνόπλιος ἦκα θεείη.''

## 73

(pp. 37-38 Kr. = Damascius, II, 217, 5-10)

Εἰ δὲ ἐν οὐρανῷ λέγεται οὗτος ὁ Ζεύς, ἔστι καὶ ἀρχικοὺς ὄντας εἰς οὐράνιον διηρῆσθαι καὶ χθόνιον, καὶ τὸν μέσον τοὺς τρεῖς πατέρας, ὡς μαρτυρεῖ καὶ τὰ λόγια·

''ἐν τούτοις ἱερὸς πρῶτος δρόμος, ἐν δ' ἄρα μέσσῳ
ἠέριος, τρίτος ἄλλος ὃς ἐν πυρὶ τὴν χθόνα θάλπει.
ἀρχαῖς γὰρ τρισὶ ταῖσδε λάβροις δουλεύει ἅπαντα.''

## 74

(p. 39 Kr. = Damascius, II, 206, 10-11)

ἀρχικοί εἰσιν ὡς πρῶτοι ἄρξαντες τοῦ ἀπορρεῖν τῶν οἰκείων πηγῶν. διὸ καὶ

''...κρηνήϊος ἀρχὴ''

ὁ διάκοσμος ὑμνεῖται.

## 75

(p. 38 Kr. = Damascius, II, 88, 7-8)

ὅτε γοῦν περὶ τοῦ ἀρχικοῦ πλήθους διαλέγεται (sc. ὁ χρησμῳδῶν)

''...ὑποκέκλιται αὐταῖς (ἔφη) ἀρχικὸς αὐλών.''

## 76

(p. 40 Kr. = Damascius, II, 88, 2-5; cf. 59, 23-25)

ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ τὰς ἴυγγας πολλὰς παραδιδόασιν οἱ θεοί·

''πολλαὶ μὲν δὴ αἵδε ἐπεμβαίνουσι φαεινοῖς
κόσμοις ἐνθρῴσκουσαι· ἐν αἷς ἀκρότητες ἔασιν
τρεῖς· <πυρίη γ' ἠδ' αἰθερίη καὶ ὑλώδης>.''

## 77

(p. 40 Kr. = Psellus, *P.G.*, 122, 1149 a 10-11)

''αἵ γε νοούμεναι <ἐκ> πατρόθεν νοέουσι καὶ αὐταί,
βουλαῖς ἀφθέγκτοις κινούμεναι ὥστε νοῆσαι.''

## 72

And, again, for these reasons, it seems to me that Plato said the very things which were later revealed by the gods. And that which the gods have termed "armed from head to toe," Plato has praised as "adorned in full armor:"

> "For, I, the Divine, have arrived, armed from head to toe."

## 73

If this Zeus is said to be in heaven, it is possible to separate the ruling beings into heavenly and earthly, and in the midst of these are the three fathers, as even the *Oracles* testify:

> "Among these is the first sacred course. Next, in the middle, is the course of air. Another, the third, is the one which heats the earth by fire. All things serve these three turbulent rulers."

## 74

They are Principles because they are the first to begin emanating their own sources. Therefore, the order is praised as

> "...Principle Source."

## 75

At any rate, when (the oracle-giver) discusses the Principle multiplicity, he says

> "...the Principle channel is inclined under them."

## 76

Likewise, the gods have taught us that there are numerous Iynges:

> "Many of these leap forth and stand upon shining worlds. Among these are three summits: <that of fire, ether, and matter>."

## 77

> "The (Iynges) which are thought by the Father also think themselves, since they are moved by his unspeakable counsels so as to think."

## 78

(pp. 40 + 44, n. 1 Kr. = Damascius, II, 201, 2-4)

οἱ γὰρ ἐπὶ μαγειῶν πατέρες εἵς τε τὸ ἐμφανὲς πάντα προάγουσιν καὶ πάλιν εἰς τὸ ἀφανὲς περιάγουσιν, ὡς ἂν

"...διαπόρθμιοι ἑστῶτες..."

κατὰ <τὸ> λόγιον φάναι, τῷ πατρὶ καὶ τῇ ὕλῃ.

## 79

(p. 40 Kr. = Psellus, *P.G.*, 122, 1132 c 12)

"πᾶς ἴσχει κόσμος νοεροὺς ἀνοχῆας ἀκαμπεῖς."

## 80

(p. 41 Kr. = Damascius, II, 87, 21-24; cf. 60, 2; Proclus, *In Parm.*, 941, 31 Co.$^2$)

ὅτι γὰρ καὶ...οἱ θεοὶ...ἡμῖν παραδιδόασι...τοὺς συνοχέας πολλούς, δηλοῖ ἐκεῖνα τὰ λόγια·

"ἀλλὰ καὶ ὑλαίοις ὅσα δουλεύει συνοχεῦσιν."

## 81

(p. 42 Kr. = Proclus, *In Parm.*, 941, 23-28 Co.$^2$)

καὶ τί δεῖ λέγειν; ὅπου καὶ τὰ λόγια διαῤῥήδην ἐπ' αὐτῶν τῶν θεῶν τῶν πρὸ τῆς νοητῆς ἐκείνης καὶ νοερᾶς τάξεως χρῆται τούτοις τοῖς ὀνόμασι·

"τοῖς δὲ πυρὸς νοεροῦ νοεροῖς πρηστῆρσιν ἅπαντα
εἵκαθε δουλεύοντα πατρὸς πειθηνίδι βουλῇ."

## 82

(p. 42 Kr. = Damascius, II, 125, 19-23)

μάλιστα δὲ συγκεκλήρωται (sc. ἡ φρουρητική) τοῖς συνοχεῦσιν, ἅτε περιειληφόσι πάντα ἐν ἑαυτοῖς καὶ συνέχουσιν· οὕτω δὲ καὶ οἱ θεοὶ λέγουσι·

"φρουρεῖν αὖ πρηστῆρσιν ἑοῖς ἀκρότητας ἔδωκεν
ἐγκεράσας ἀλκῆς ἴδιον μένος ἐν συνοχεῦσιν."

## 83

(p. 42 Kr. = Damascius, II, 43, 20-21)

διὸ καὶ ὑπὸ τῶν θεῶν οἱ συνοχεῖς

"...ὁλοποιοί..."

παραδέδονται τῶν νοερῶν διακόσμων.

78

For the fathers who preside over magical operations cause all things to appear and then to disappear, since

"...they are couriers..."

to the Father and to matter, to speak according to the oracle.

79

"Every world possesses unbending, Intellectual Supports."

80

For that even...the gods...have taught us...there are many Connectors...these matters the *Oracles* make clear:

"But also, all those things which serve Material Connectors."

81

And need we say more, when even the *Oracles*, in reference to the very gods who exist prior to that intelligible-and-intellectual order, expressly use these names:

"All things yield to the intellectual Lightning-bolts of the intellectual Fire, serving the persuasive will of the Father."

82

Most of all, (the function of guarding) has been assigned to the Connectors, inasmuch as they encompass and connect all things within themselves. The gods also speak in this way:

"He has given the summits the protection of his (intellectual) Lightning-bolts, having mixed his own force of strength among the Connectors."

83

Therefore, it is imparted by the gods that the Connectors are the

"...unifiers..."

of the intellectual orders.

## 84

(p. 42 Kr. = Proclus, *Th. pl.*, IV, 21; 64, 11-12 S.-W.; cf. Tardieu, Lewy$^2$, 1978, p. 521)

''πάντας γὰρ συνέχων''

(sc. ὁ πρῶτος συνοχεύς) τῇ ἑαυτοῦ μιᾷ τῆς ὑπάρξεως ἀκρότητι, κατὰ τὸ λόγιον,

''αὐτὸς πᾶς ἔξω ὑπάρχει.''

## 85

(p. 42 Kr. = Proclus, *Th. pl.*, IV, 39; 111, 18-23 S.-W.)

ὁ μὲν πρῶτος (τελετάρχης)...ἡνιοχεῖ τὸν

''...ταρσὸν τοῦ πυρός...''

ὁ δὲ μέσος...τελειοῖ...τὸν αἰθέρα...ὁ δὲ τρίτος...τὴν ὕλην τελειοῖ.

## 86

(p. 43 Kr. = Proclus, *In Tim.*, II, 58, 7-8)

καὶ

''...ψυχοκράτωρ''

ὁ τοῖς αἰθερίοις ἐπιβεβηκώς ἐστι

''τελετάρχης.''

## 87

(p. 43 Kr. = Proclus, *In Crat.*, 20, 26-30)

τρανέστερον δὲ οἱ θεουργοὶ διδάσκουσιν, καὶ αἱ παρὰ τῶν θεῶν αὐτῶν φῆμαι·

''ἀλλ' ὄνομα σεμνὸν καὶ ἀκοιμήτῳ στροφάλιγγι
κόσμοις ἐνθρῷσκον κραιπνὴν διὰ πατρὸς ἐνιπήν.''

## 88

(p. 44 Kr. = Psellus, *P.G.*, 122, 1137 a 1-2)

''[ἡ φύσις] πείθει πιστεύειν εἶναι τοὺς δαίμονας ἀγνούς,
καὶ τὰ κακῆς ὕλης βλαστήματα χρηστὰ καὶ ἐσθλά.''

## 84

"For (the First Connector), encompassing all things"
in the singular summit of his own existence, according to the oracle,
"exists, himself, entirely outside."

## 85

The first (Teletarch)...guides the
"...wing of fire..."
the middle (Teletarch)...perfects...the ether...the third (Teletarch)...perfects... matter.

## 86

And the
"...ruler of souls"
who stands on the Ethereal Worlds is a
"Teletarch."

## 87

The theurgists teach (these things) very clearly, and the *Oracles* from the gods themselves:

> "But a holy name, in sleepless motion, leaps into the worlds at the hasty command of the Father."

## 88

> "[Nature] persuades us to believe that the demons are pure, and that the offspring of evil matter are good and useful."

## 89

(p. 44 Kr. = Psellus, *Hypotyp.* 23; p. 75, 19-20 K.)

τὸ δὲ καθέλκει τὰς ψυχάς, ὃ καὶ

"...θηροπόλον καὶ ἀναιδὲς"

καλεῖται τὴν φύσιν ἐπιστρεφόμενον.

## 90

(p. 45 Kr. = Psellus, *P.G.*, 122, 1140 b 12 - c 2)

"...ἐκ δ' ἄρα κόλπων
γαίης θρῴσκουσιν χθόνιοι κύνες οὔποτ' ἀληθὲς
σῆμα βροτῷ δεικνύντες."

περὶ δαιμόνων ἐνύλων ὁ λόγος· καὶ κύνας μὲν τούτους καλεῖ, ὡς τιμωροὺς τῶν ψυχῶν.

## 91

(p. 45 Kr. = Damascius, *In Phaedonem*, 341 (230, 30-32 N.) W.)

ἀπὸ δὲ τῶν ἀερίων ἄρχονται συνυφίστασθαι οἱ ἄλογοι δαίμονες· διὸ καὶ τὸ λόγιόν φησιν·

"ἠερίων ἐλάτειρα κυνῶν χθονίων τε καὶ ὑγρῶν."

## 92

(p. 45 Kr. = Proclus, *In Tim.*, III, 110, 4-5)

διὸ καὶ τὸ λόγιον

"...ὑδροβατῆρας,"

καλεῖ τοὺς θεοὺς τούτους.

## 93

(p. 46, n. 1 Kr. = Psellus, *De oper. daem.*, p. 30, 8 Boissonade; *P.G.* 122, 865 a)

οὕτω δὴ καὶ περὶ τὰ τῶν δαιμόνων

"...πολυχεύμονα φῦλα."

## 94

(p. 47 Kr. = Proclus, *In Tim.*, I, 318, 13-18; cf. 408, 19-20)

τὰ λόγια παραδίδωσιν (τὸν δημιουργὸν)...τὰς ἡμετέρας γεννῶντα ψυχὰς καὶ εἰς γένεσιν πέμποντα, περὶ οὗ καὶ ταῦτά φησιν, ἃ καὶ ὁ Τίμαιος· κατέθετο γὰρ

"...νοῦν μὲν ψυχῇ, <ψυχὴν δ'> ἐνὶ σώματι ἀργῷ
ἡμέας ἐγκατέθηκε πατὴρ ἀνδρῶν τε θεῶν τε."

## 89

That (race of evil demons) draws down souls, (a race) which is also called

> "...bestial and shameless,"

since it is turned towards Nature.

## 90

> "...from the hollows of the earth leap chthonian dogs, who never show a true sign to a mortal."

The oracle is about demons involved in matter. These (demons) are called dogs because they are the avengers of souls.

## 91

Starting from the spirits of the air, irrational demons begin to come into existence. Therefore, the oracle says:

> "Driver (fem.) of dogs of the air, earth, and water."

## 92

Therefore, even the oracle calls these gods

> "...aquatic."

## 93

Thus, also, concerning the

> "...multiflowing tribes"

of demons.

## 94

The *Oracles* teach that (the Demiurge)...brings forth our souls and sends them into generation, a subject about which both the *Oracles* and Timaeus speak. For (the Demiurge) has placed

> "...Intellect in Soul, but in the sluggish body he has placed our <soul>, he, the Father of gods and men."

## 95

(p. 47, n. 1 Kr. = Proclus, *In rem p.*, II, 143, 22-27)

τοῦτον <τὸν> χαρακτῆρα (sc. τὸ χῖ) τῇ οὐσίᾳ τῶν ψυχῶν

''...ἐγκάρδιον ἐνθείς...''

πάσης ἴδιον ὄντα ψυχῆς...ταῦτα...θεουργῶν καὶ θεῶν ἄγνωστα γραφόντων.

## 96

(p. 47 Kr. = Psellus, *P.G.*, 122, 1141 c 7-9)

''ὅττι ψυχή, πῦρ δυνάμει πατρὸς οὖσα φαεινόν,
ἀθάνατός τε μένει καὶ ζωῆς δεσπότις ἐστὶν
καὶ ἴσχει <κόσμου> πολλῶν πληρώματα κόλπων.''

## 97

(p. 48 Kr. = Psellus, *P.G.*, 122, 1137 a 11-13)

''<ἀμπταμένη> ψυχὴ μερόπων θεὸν ἄγξει ἐς αὐτήν,
<κ'> οὐδὲν θνητὸν ἔχουσα ὅλη <θεόθεν> μεμέθυσται·
ἁρμονίαν αὔχει γάρ, ὑφ' ᾗ πέλε σῶμα βρότειον.''

## 98*

(Boethius, *Philosophiae consolatio*, IV, 6, 38; p. 82, Bieler)

Nam ut quidam me quoque excellentior:

''ἀνδρὸς δὴ ἱεροῦ δέμας αἰθέρες οἰκοδόμησαν.''

## 99

(p. 48 Kr. = Proclus, *In rem p.*, II, 99, 1-4)

<ἃς> καὶ οἱ θεοί φασιν τὴν γένεσιν ἐπιστρεφομένας

''...θητεύειν, ἀλλ' ἀδαμάστῳ
τωὐχένι θητευούσας...''

ἀνάγεσθαι πάλιν ἐντεῦθεν καταλιπούσας τὴν γένεσιν.

## 100

(p. 48 Kr. = Proclus, *In rem p.*, II, 156, 17-18; cf. 347, 1)

τὴν δὲ ὕλην

''...αὐχμηράν''

ὡς ἄγονον καὶ τῶν λογίων λεγόντων ἀκούομεν.

## 95

This character (sc. the letter Chi), which belongs to the essence of souls,

> "...is placed in the heart"

as the property of every soul...these...are (the doctrines) of the theurgists and gods when they are describing unknown things.

## 96

> "Because the Soul, existing as a radiant fire by the power of the Father, remains immortal. It is the Mistress of Life and possesses full measures of the many wombs <of the world>."

## 97

> "<Taking wing>, the soul of mortals will press God into itself. And possessing nothing mortal, the soul is completely intoxicated <by God>. Therefore, boast of the harmony under which the mortal body exists."

## 98

For as someone more eminent than I said:

> "The ethers have strengthened the body of a sacred man."

## 99

(Those souls) <which> even the gods say are turned about

> "...to serve (generation), but having served with an untamed neck..."

leave generation behind to go back up there.

## 100

We hear the *Oracles* say that matter is

> "squalid,"

since it is sterile.

## 101

(p. 49 Kr. = Psellus, *P.G.*, 122, 1136 c 12)

''...μὴ φύσεως καλέσῃς αὔτοπτον ἄγαλμα.''

## 102

(p. 49 + n. 2 Kr. = Proclus, *Th. pl.*, 317, 26-30 Portus)

ἡ γὰρ τῆς φύσεως πηγὴ καὶ εἱμαρμένην πρωτίστη παρ' αὐτῶν ἀποκαλεῖται τῶν θεῶν·

''μὴ φύσιν ἐμβλέψῃς· εἱμαρμένον οὔνομα τῆσδε.''

## 103

(p. 50, n. 1 Kr. = Psellus, *P.G.*, 122, 1145 c 9-11)

''μηδὲ συναυξήσῃς θεἰμαρμένον...''

Εἱμαρμένην οἱ σοφώτεροι τῶν Ἑλλήνων τὴν φύσιν κατονομάζουσι.

## 104

(p. 64 Kr. = Psellus, *P.G.*, 122, 1137 c 8-9)

''...μὴ πνεῦμα μολύνῃς μηδὲ βαθύνῃς
τοὐπίπεδον...''

## 105

(p. 64 Kr. = Proclus, *Exc. chald.*, III; p. 193, 17-24 Pitra)

ῥίζα τῆς κακίας τὸ σῶμα...τὸ δὲ καταβαλεῖν εἰς γῆν τὸ ἀφ' ἡμῶν ἐκκόψαι...εἰς ἣν καὶ ζῆλον καὶ φθόνον καταβλητέον...ὑλικὰ γὰρ ὄντα τὴν ὕλην ἔχει τιθήνην· τὸ δὲ

''...φρενὶ μὴ σβέσαι...''

πρὸς τὴν ἀπόκλεισιν, οὐ πρὸς τὸν ἀφανισμὸν εἴρηται.

## 106

(p. 50 Kr. = Psellus, *P.G.*, 122, 1136 a 1)

''...τολμηρᾶς φύσεως, ἄνθρωπε, τέχνασμα.''

## 107

(pp. 64-65 Kr. = Psellus, *P.G.*, 122, 1128 b 8 - c 7)

''μὴ τὰ πελώρια μέτρα γύης ὑπὸ σὴν φρένα βάλλου·
οὐ γὰρ ἀληθείης φυτὸν ἐν χθονί <ἐστιν>.
μηδὲ μέτρει μέτρον ἠελίου κανόνας συναθροίσας·

### 101

"...do not invoke the self-revealed image of Nature."

### 102

For the source of Nature and the very first Destiny is named by the gods themselves:

"Do not gaze at Nature; her name is Destiny."

### 103

"Do not aid in increasing Destiny..."

The wisest of the Greeks designate Destiny as Nature.

### 104

"...do not defile the pneuma nor deepen the surface."

### 105

The root of evil is the body...the descent to earth is the severing of ourselves...where both jealousy and envy must be rejected...for being material, they have matter as a nurse. And

"...not to quench in your mind..."

is said with regard to the shutting out, not the annihilation (of desire).

### 106

"...O, man, cunning creation of an impudent nature."

### 107

"Do not cast into your mind the huge measures of earth, for the plant of truth does not exist on earth. Do not measure the extent of the sun by joining rods together, for he is borne

ἀϊδίῳ βουλῇ φέρεται πατρός, οὐχ ἕνεκεν σοῦ.
μήνης ῥοῖζον ἔασον· ἀεὶ τρέχει ἔργῳ ἀνάγκης.
ἀστέριον προπόρευμα σέθεν χάριν οὐκ ἐλοχεύθη.
αἴθριος ὀρνίθων ταρσὸς πλατὺς οὔποτ' ἀληθής,
οὐ θυσιῶν σπλάγχνων τε τομαί· τάδ' ἀθύρματα πάντα,
ἐμπορικῆς ἀπάτης στηρίγματα. φεῦγε σὺ ταῦτα,
μέλλων εὐσεβίης ἱερὸν παράδεισον ἀνοίγειν,
ἔνθ' ἀρετὴ σοφία τε καὶ εὐνομία συνάγονται.''

## 108

(p. 50 Kr. = Proclus, *In Crat.*, 20, 31-21, 2)

καὶ ἄλλο λόγιον τοῦτο·

''σύμβολα γὰρ πατρικὸς νόος ἔσπειρεν κατὰ κόσμον,
ὃς τὰ νοητὰ νοεῖ· καὶ κάλλη ἄφραστα καλεῖται.''

## 109

(p. 50 Kr. = Psellus, *P.G.*, 122, 1148, a 12-14)

''ἀλλ' οὐκ εἰσδέχεται κείνης τὸ θέλειν πατρικὸς νοῦς,
μέχρις ἂν ἐξέλθῃ λήθης καὶ ῥῆμα λαλήσῃ
μνήμην ἐνθεμένη πατρικοῦ συνθήματος ἀγνοῦ.''

## 110

(p. 51 Kr. = Psellus, *P.G.*, 122, 1129 c 12 - d 4)

''δίζεο <καὶ> ψυχῆς ὀχετόν, ὅθεν ἔν τινι τάξει
σώματι θητεύσασ' <ὑπέβη καὶ πῶς> ἐπὶ τάξιν
αὖθις ἀναστήσεις, ἱερῷ λόγῳ ἔργον ἑνώσας.''

Τοῦτ' ἔστιν· ζήτει τὴν ἀρχὴν τῆς ψυχῆς, πόθεν παρήχθη καὶ ἐδούλευσε σώματι καὶ πῶς ἄν τις ταύτην ἀναστησάμενος καὶ ἐγείρας διὰ τῶν τελεστικῶν ἔργων ἐπαναγάγῃ ὅθεν ἀφίκετο.

## 111

(p. 51 Kr. = Proclus, *In Tim.*, II, 312, 22-28)

εὔτροχον δὲ τὸ νοερὸν...τὸ περὶ τὸ νοητὸν ὡς κέντρον φερόμενον·

''κέντρῳ ἐπισπέρχων σαυτὸν φωτὸς κελάδοντος,''

φησί τις θεῶν.

along by the eternal will of the Father and not for your sake. Let be the rushing motion of the moon; she forever runs her course by the action of Necessity. The starry procession has not been brought forth for you sake. The wide-winged flight of birds is never true, nor the cuttings and entrails of sacrificial victims. All these are playthings, the props of commercial fraud. Flee these things, if you would open the sacred paradise of piety, where virtue, wisdom, and good order are brought together."

## 108

And another oracle is this:

"For the Paternal Intellect has sown symbols throughout the cosmos, (the Intellect) which thinks the intelligibles. And (these intelligibles) are called inexpressible beauties."

## 109

"But the Paternal Intellect does not receive the will of (the soul) until (the soul) emerges from forgetfulness and speaks a word, remembering the pure, paternal token."

## 110

"Seek out the channel of the soul, from where it <descended> in a certain order to serve the body; <and> seek <how> you will raise it up again to its order by combining (ritual) action with a sacred word."

That is, seek the source of the soul, from where (the soul) has been led astray and has served the body; and how someone, raising it up and awakening it by means of the telestic rites, might lead it back up from where it has come.

## 111

The intellectual (faculty) is well-wheeled...that which is borne around the intelligible as around a center:

"Urging yourself onward to the center of the clamorous light,"

says one of the gods.

## 112

(p. 51 Kr. = Psellus, *P.G.*, 122, 1137 b 11-12)

''οἰγνύσθω ψυχῆς βάθος ἄμβροτον· ὄμματα πάντα
ἄρδην ἐκπέτασον ἄνω.''

## 113

(p. 52 Kr. = Lydus, *De mens.*, I, 11; 3, 3-6 W.)

ταύτῃ καὶ ''χαλινῶσαι'' τὴν ψυχὴν θεσπίζει τὰ λόγια·

''χρὴ δὲ χαλινῶσαι ψυχὴν βροτὸν ὄντα νοητόν,
ὄφρα μὴ ἐγκύρσῃ χθονὶ δυσμόρῳ, ἀλλὰ σαωθῇ.''

## 114

(p. 52 Kr. = Proclus, *Th. pl.*, 297, 32-35 Portus)

τὸν Προμηθέα...προνοοῦντα τῇ λογικῆς ἡμῶν ζωῆς, ἵνα μὴ

''...βαπτισθεῖσα χθονὸς οἴστροις''

καὶ ταῖς τῆς φύσεως ἀνάγκαις, ὥς φησί τις θεῶν, ἀπόληται.

## 115

(p. 52 Kr. = Psellus, *P.G.*, 122, 1144 d 1-2)

''χρή σε σπεύδειν πρὸς τὸ φάος καὶ πρὸς πατρὸς αὐγάς,
ἔνθεν ἐπέμφθη σοι ψυχὴ πολὺν ἐσσαμένη νοῦν.''

## 116

(p. 52 Kr. = Proclus, *In Crat.*, 88, 4-6)

''οὐ γὰρ ἐφικτὰ τὰ θεῖα βροτοῖς τοῖς σῶμα νοοῦσιν
ἀλλ' ὅσσοι γυμνῆτες ἄνω σπεύδουσι πρὸς ὕψος,''

ὥς φησι τὸ λόγιον.

## 117

(p. 52 Kr. = Proclus, *In Alc.*, 82 [177, 6-10 Cr.] W.)

καὶ τῶν φύσεων αἱ μὲν ἐρρωμενέστεραι δι' ἑαυτῶν θεῶνται τὸ ἀληθὲς καὶ εἰσιν εὑρετικώτεραι

''σωζόμεναι δι' ἑῆς ἀλκῆς...''

ὥς φησι τὸ λόγιον, αἱ δὲ ἀσθενέστεραι ἐπιδέονται καὶ διδασκαλίας καὶ τῆς παρ' ἄλλων
5 ἀναμνήσεως τῶν τὸ τέλειον ἐχόντων ἐν οἷς εἰσὶν ἀτελεῖς.

### 112

"Let the immortal depth of your soul be opened. May all of your eyes stretch upward on high."

### 113

And in this way, the *Oracles* decree that the soul "be held in check:"

"A thinking mortal must hold the soul in check, so that it might not fall in with ill-fated earth but be saved."

### 114

(It is said) that Prometheus...forethought our rational life, so that we would not be

"...submerged in the passions of the earth,"

and be destroyed by the necessities of Nature, as one of the gods says.

### 115

"You must hasten toward the light and toward the rays of the Father, from where the soul, clothed in mighty intellect, has been sent to you."

### 116

"For the Divine is accessible not to mortals who think corporeally, but to all those who, naked, hasten upward toward the heights,"

as the oracle says.

### 117

And the more vigorous natures behold the truth by themselves and are more inventive,

"saved through their own strength..."

as the oracle says, while the weaker ones need both instruction and reminders from others who possess perfection in those areas where they lack it.

## 118

(p. 59 Kr. = Synesius, *De insomn.*, 135 a-b)

ἀκουσάτω τῶν ἱερῶν λογίων, ἃ λέγει περὶ διαφόρων ὁδῶν...καθ' ὃν ἔξεστι τὸ ἔνδοθεν σπέρμα αὐξῆσαι·

''τοῖς δὲ διδακτὸν ἔδωκε φάους γνώρισμα λαβέσθαι·
τοὺς δὲ καὶ ὑπνώοντας ἑῆς ἐνεκάρπισεν ἀλκῆς.''

## 119

(Hierocles, *In aur. carm.*, 111 [478 a 21-b 4 M.$^2$] 16-20 K.)

Δεῖ οὖν πρὸς...κάθαρσιν τοῦ αὐγοειδοῦς ἡμῶν σώματος τῆς τῶν ὑλικῶν μολυσμῶν ἀποθέσεως καὶ τῶν ἱερῶν καθαρμῶν παραλήψεως καὶ τῆς ἐπεγειρούσης ἡμᾶς πρὸς τὴν ἐντεύθεν ἀνάπτησιν

''...θεοσυνδέτου ἀλκῆς.''

## 120

(Hierocles, *In aur. carm.*, 112 [478 b 20-21 M.$^2$] 8-9 K.)

(δέοι)...καθαρότητος ἐπιμέλειαν ποιεῖσθαι τῆς περὶ τὸ αὐγοειδὲς ἡμῶν σῶμα, ὃ καὶ

''...ψυχῆς λεπτὸν ὄχημα''

οἱ χρησμοὶ καλοῦσιν.

## 121

(p. 53 Kr. = Proclus, *In Tim.*, I, 211, 19-24)

ἐπὶ δὲ ταύταις ''ἡ ἐμπέλασις''—οὕτως γὰρ αὐτὴν καλεῖ τὸ λόγιον·

''τῷ πυρὶ γὰρ βροτὸς ἐμπελάσας θεόθεν φάος ἕξει.''

μείζω τὴν κοινωνίαν ἡμῖν παρεχομένη καὶ τρανεστέραν τὴν μετουσίαν τοῦ τῶν θεῶν φωτός.

## 122

(p. 53 Kr. = Proclus, *Exc. chald.*, I; 192, 13-17 Pitra)

ἡ δὲ τῶν ἀγγέλων μερὶς πῶς ἀνάγει ψυχήν;

''τὴν ψυχὴν φέγγουσα πυρί...''

(φησί)· τοῦτ' ἔστι περιλάμπουσα αὐτὴν πανταχόθεν, καὶ πλήρη ποιοῦσα τοῦ ἀχράντου πυρὸς ὃ ἐνδίδωσιν αὐτῇ τάξιν ἄκλιτον καὶ δύναμιν, δι' ἣν οὐκ ἐκροιζεῖται εἰς τὴν ὑλικὴν
5 ἀταξίαν ἀλλὰ συνάπτεται τῇ φωτὶ τῶν θείων.

## 118

Let him listen to the sacred *Oracles* which speak of diverging paths...according to which it is possible to increase the seed from within:

> "To some, (God) has granted (the ability) to apprehend the symbol of light through instruction. Others, however, he has fructified with their own strength while they are sleeping."

## 119

Therefore...for the purification of our luminous body there is a need to get rid of material defilements, a need to undergo sacred purifications, and a need for the

> "...strength that binds us to God"

exciting us toward the flight up there.

## 120

(We must)...take care of the purification of our luminous body, which the *Oracles* also call

> "...delicate vehicle of the soul."

## 121

In addition to these things, there is the "approaching"—for the oracle calls it thus:

> "For the mortal who has approached the fire will possess the light from God."

(The "approaching") allows us a greater communion and a more distinct participation in the light of the gods.

## 122

How does the order of angels cause the soul to ascend?

> "By making the soul bright with fire..."

(the oracle says). That is, illuminating the soul on all sides and filling it with pure fire, which gives it an unswerving order and power through which it does not rush into material disorder but makes contact with the light of the divine beings.

## 123

(p. 53 Kr. = Proclus, *Exc. chald.*, I; 192, 17-19 Pitra)

καὶ ἀμιγῆ ποιεῖ πρὸς τὴν ὕλην τῷ

"...πνεύματι θερμῷ
κουφίζουσα..."

καὶ ποιοῦσα μετέωρον διὰ τῆς ἀναγωγοῦ ζωῆς· τὸ γὰρ "πνεῦμα τὸ θερμὸν" ζωῆς ἐστι μετάδοσις.

## 124

(p. 53 Kr. = Psellus, *P.G.*, 122, 1144 c 4)

"ψυχῆς ἐξωστῆρες ἀνάπνοοι εὔλυτοί εἰσιν."

## 125

(p. 17 Kr. = *Anecd. oxon.*, III, 182, 19-22 Cramer [in epist. 17, Michel Italicus])

ὁ δὲ δὶς παρ' αὐτοῖς (sc. τοῖς Χαλδαίοις) ἐπέκεινα μεταδίδωσιν ἑαυτοῦ τοῖς κόσμοις καὶ κατασπείρει

"...εὔλυτα φέγγη,"

ἵνα καὶ τοῖς ἐκείνων χρήσωμαι ῥήμασιν.

## 126

(p. 53 Kr. = Proclus, *Th. pl.*, III, 1; 5, 15-16 S.-W.)

(παρὰ τῷ Πλάτωνι ἡ θεολογία)...

"πυρσὸν ἀνάψας'..."

ἀφ' οὗ δὴ μάλιστα πρὸς τὴν ἄγνωστον συνάπτονται τοῦ ἑνὸς ὑπεροχήν.

## 127

(p. 53 Kr. = Psellus, *P.G.*, 122, 1133 c 9)

"πάντοθεν ἀπλάστῳ ψυχῇ πυρὸς ἡνία τεῖνον."

## 128

(pp. 54 + 61 Kr. = Psellus, *P.G.*, 1140 b 1-2)

"...ἐκτείνας πύριον νοῦν
ἔργον ἐπ' εὐσεβίης ῥευστὸν καὶ σῶμα σαώσεις."

## 123
## (continues fr. 122)

And (the order of angels) causes a separation with matter by

"...lightening (the soul) with a warm breath,"

and causing a rising up through the anagogic life. For the "warm breath" is the sharing of life.

## 124

"Those who, by inhaling, drive out the soul, are free."

## 125

According to (the Chaldeans), the Twice Transcendent shares himself with the worlds and sows

"...lights which are set free,"

to use their words.

## 126

(The theology of Plato)...

"has lit the fire..."

by which especially (souls) make contact with the unknowable transcendence of the One.

## 127

"On all sides, the reins of fire extend from the unformed soul."

## 128

"...if you extend your mind, illumined by fire, to the work of piety, you will also save the flowing body."

## 129

(p. 61 + n. 2 Kr. = Julian, *Or.* V, 178 d)

μαρτυρεῖ δὲ τούτοις καὶ τὰ τῶν θεῶν λόγια, φημὶ δέ, ὅτι διὰ τῆς ἁγιστείας οὐχ ἡ ψυχὴ μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὰ σώματα βοηθείας πολλῆς καὶ σωτηρίας ἀξιοῦται·

''σώζετε καὶ τὸ πικρᾶς ὕλης περίβλημα βρότειον,''

οἱ θεοὶ τοῖς ὑπεράγνοις παρακελευόμενοι τῶν θεουργῶν κατεπαγγέλονται.

## 130

(p. 54 Kr. = Proclus, *In Tim.*, III, 266, 18-23)

διὸ καὶ νοήσασαι (sc. αἱ ψυχαί) τὰ ἔργα τοῦ πατρὸς

''μοίρης εἱμαρτῆς τὸ πτερὸν φεύγουσιν ἀναιδές,''

ὥς φησι τὸ λόγιον,

''ἐν δὲ θεῷ κεῖνται πυρσοὺς ἕλκουσαι ἀκμαίους
ἐκ πατρόθεν κατιόντας, ἀφ' ὧν ψυχὴ κατιόντων
ἐμπυρίων δρέπεται καρπῶν ψυχοτρόφον ἄνθος.''

## 131

(p. 54 Kr. = Damascius, *In Phaedonem*, 371 (244, 20-21 N.) W.)

διὸ καὶ τὸ λόγιόν φησι τὰς ψυχὰς ἀναγομένας

''...τὸν Παῖανα ἀείδειν.''

## 132

(p. 55 Kr. = Proclus, *In Crat.*, 67, 19-20)

καὶ γὰρ τὰ λόγια περὶ ἐκείνων ὡς ἀφθέγκτων ἐνεδείξατο, καὶ προσέθηκεν τὸ

''...σῖγ' ἔχε, μύστα.''

## 133

(p. 55 Kr. = Proclus, *In Crat.*, 101, 3-8)

διὸ καὶ ὁ θεουργὸς ὁ τῆς τελετῆς τούτου προκαθηγούμενος ἀπὸ τῶν καθάρσεων ἄρχεται καὶ τῶν περιρράνσεων·

''αὐτὸς δ' ἐν πρώτοις ἱερεὺς πυρὸς ἔργα κυβερνῶν
κύματι βαινέσθω παγερῷ βαρυηχέος ἅλμης,''

ὥς φησι τὸ λόγιον περὶ αὐτοῦ.

## 129

And the *Oracles* of the gods testify to these things. I mean that through the holy rites not only the soul, but even the body is thought worthy of much help and salvation:

> "Save also the mortal covering of bitter matter,"

the gods announce to the most holy of the theurgists when they are encouraging them.

## 130

Therefore, (the souls), by perceiving the works of the Father,

> "flee the shameful wing of allotted fate,"

as the oracle says,

> "and rest in God, drawing in the flowering flames which come down from the Father. From these flames, as they are descending, the soul plucks the soul-nourished flower of fiery fruits."

## 131

Therefore, the oracle says that the souls, ascending,

> "...sing a hymn to Paean."

## 132

For the *Oracles* concerning them point out that they are ineffable, and add:

> "...keep silent, initiate."

## 133

Therefore, even the theurgist who conducts this initiation begins with purifications and sprinklings:

> "Above all, let the priest himself who governs the works of fire, be sprinkled with the icy billow of the deep-roaring sea,"

as the oracle says about him.

## 134

(Schol. *Paris. gr.*, 1853, fol. 68 r°, ed. H.D. Saffrey, *RPh*, 1969, p. 64)

λόγιον·

''μηδ' ἐπὶ μισοφαῆ κόσμον σπεύδειν λάβρον ὕλης,
ἔνθα φόνος στάσιές τε καὶ ἀργαλέων φύσις ἀτμῶν
αὐχμηραί τε νόσοι καὶ σήψιες ἔργα τε ῥευστά·
ταῦτα χρεὼ φεύγειν τὸν ἐρᾶν μέλλοντα πατρὸς νοῦ.''

## 135

(Intro. + v. 1: p. 55 Kr. = Proclus, *In Alc.*, 17-18 [40, 1-5 Cr.] W.; v. 2: *Paris. gr.*, 1853, fol. 68 r°, ed. H.D. Saffrey, *ibid.*, pp. 67-68. Intro. + v. 3: p. 55 Kr. = Proclus, *In Alc.*, 18 [40, 6-7 Cr.] W.; cf. *Paris. gr.*, 1853, *ibid.*)

διὸ καὶ οἱ θεοὶ παρακελεύονται μὴ πρότερον εἰς ἐκείνους (sc. δαίμονας) βλέπειν, πρὶν ταῖς ἀπὸ τῶν τελετῶν φραχθῶμεν δυνάμεσιν·

''οὐ γὰρ χρὴ κείνους σε βλέπειν πρὶν σῶμα τελεσθῇς·
ὄντες γὰρ χθόνιοι χαλεποὶ κύνες εἰσὶν ἀναιδεῖς.''

καὶ διὰ τοῦτο τὰ λόγια προστίθησιν ὅτι

''τὰς ψυχὰς θέλγοντες ἀεὶ τελετῶν ἀπάγουσιν.''

## 136

(p. 56 Kr. = Proclus, *In Parm.*, 990, 27-37 Co.[2])

καὶ γὰρ ἐπὶ θεωρίας καὶ ἐπὶ τελεστικῆς [καὶ] τοῦτό ἐστι τὸ ποιοῦν ἀσφαλῆ καὶ ἄπταιστον ἡμῖν τὴν ἄνοδον, ἡ ἐν τάξει πρόοδος· ὡς γοῦν φησι καὶ τὸ λόγιον·

''οὐδενὸς εἵνεκεν ἄλλου ἀποστρέφεται θεὸς ἄνδρα
καὶ ζώσῃ δυνάμει κενεὰς ἐπὶ πέμπει ἀταρπούς,''

ὡς ὅταν ἀτάκτως καὶ πλημμελῶς ἐπὶ τὰ θειότατα τῶν θεωρημάτων ἢ τῶν ἔργων...ποιησώμεθα τὴν ἄνοδον.

## 137

(p. 60 Kr. = Proclus, *In rem p.*, II, 154, 17-19)

''...θέει ἄγγελος ἐν δυνάμει ζῶν,''

φησὶν τὸ λόγιον, ὅστις ἐστὶν ὡς ἀληθῶς ἱερατικός.

## 138

(p. 60 Kr. = Olympiodorus, *In Phaedonem*, 149 [64, 2-5 N.] W.)

ἀλλὰ μὴν οὐδὲ τὰς τῶν θεουργῶν ψυχὰς βούλεται μένειν ἀεὶ ἐν τῷ νοητῷ, ἀλλὰ καὶ κατιέναι εἰς γένεσιν, περὶ ὧν φησιν τὸ λόγιον·

''...ἀγγελικῷ ἐνὶ χώρῳ.''

### 134

Oracle:

> "Do not hasten to the light-hating world, boisterous of matter, where there is murder, discord, foul odors, squalid illnesses, corruptions, and fluctuating works. He who intends to love the Intellect of the Father must flee these things."

### 135

Therefore, even the gods exhort us not to gaze at (these demons) beforehand, until we have been strengthened by the powers from the initiation rites:

> "For you must not gaze at them until you have your body initiated. Being terrestrial, these ill-tempered dogs are shameless."

And for this reason, the *Oracles* add that

> "they enchant souls, forever turning them away from the rites."

### 136

For in terms of both contemplative vision and telestic art, it is this which makes the ascent safe and sure for us—progress in an orderly fashion. At any rate, as the oracle says:

> "For no other reason does God turn away from man and, with his living power, send him on empty pathways,"

as whenever, in a disorderly and incorrect fashion, we make the ascent to the most holy of the visions or works.

### 137

Whoever lives a truly sacerdotal life, says the oracle,

> "...shines as an angel, living in power."

### 138

But he (sc. Plato) holds that the souls of the theurgists do not remain forever in the intelligible order, but that they, too, descend into generation, concerning whom the oracle says:

> "...in the angelic order."

## 139

(p. 56 Kr. = Proclus, *In Tim.*, I, 211, 11-13)

διὸ καὶ τὸ λόγιον

"...τὴν πυριθαλπῆ
ἔννοιαν..."

πρωτίστην ἔχειν τάξιν ἐν τῇ ἱερᾷ θρησκείᾳ παρεκελεύσατο.

## 140

(p. 56 Kr. = Proclus, *In Tim.*, I, 212, 12-18)

Δεῖ...καὶ ἀδιάλειπτως ἔχεσθαι τῆς περὶ τὸ θεῖον θρησκείας·

"δηθύνοντι βροτῷ κραιπνοὶ μάκαρες τελέθουσιν."

## 141

(p. 56 Kr. = Proclus, *In Parm.*, 1094, 25-27 Co.[2])

...τὸ περὶ τῶν θεῶν ῥηθὲν λέγον, ὡς ἄρα·

"ἔκλυσίς ἐστι θεοῦ νωθρὸς βροτὸς ἐς τάδε νεύων."

## 142

(p. 56 Kr. = Proclus, *In rem p.*, II, 242, 8-12)

ταῦτα καὶ τῶν θεῶν εἰπόντων πρὸς τοὺς θεουργούς· ἀσωμάτων γὰρ ὄντων, φασίν, ἡμῶν

"...σώματα τοῖς αὐτόπτοις φάσμασιν ὑμῶν
εἵνεκεν ἐνδέδεται..."

## 143

(p. 56, n. 2 Kr. = Proclus, *In rem p.*, I, 39, 17-22)

δηλοῖ δὲ καὶ τὰ λόγια πρὸς τὸν θεουργὸν λέγοντα σαφῶς, ὅτι ἀσώματα μέν ἐστι τὰ θεῖα πάντα, σώματα δὲ αὐτοῖς ὑμῶν ἕνεκεν ἐνδέδεται μὴ δυναμένων μετασχεῖν ἀσωμάτως τῶν ἀσωμάτων διὰ τὴν

"σωματικὴν εἰς ἣν ἐνεκεντρίσθητε φύσιν..."

## 144

(p. 57 Kr. = Simplicius, *In Phys.*, 613, 7-8)

ἐν τουτῷ (φῶτι) γὰρ

"...τὰ ἀτύπωτα τυποῦσθαί"

φησι κατὰ τὸ λόγιον.

### 139

Therefore, even the oracle has advised that

> "...the fire-heated thought..."

holds the very first order in sacred worship.

### 140

It is necessary...to take part continuously in the worship of the Divine:

> "To a mortal tarrying (in prayer), the blessed ones are quick (to act)."

### 141

...stating that which is spoken by the gods, namely:

> "It is the loosing of the god when the sluggish mortal inclines toward that place."

### 142

And the gods say these things to the theurgists, for they say that although we are incorporeal,

> "...bodies have been attached to our self-revealed apparitions for your sakes..."

### 143

It is clear that the *Oracles* say plainly to the theurgist that all the divine beings are incorporeal, but that for your sake, bodies have been attached to them, since you do not have the power of sharing incorporeality with the incorporeal beings because of

> "the corporeal nature onto which you have been grafted..."

### 144

For in this (light)

> "...the unformed are formed,"

it says according to the oracle.

## 145

(p. 57 Kr. = Proclus, *In Crat.*, 31, 12-14)

διὸ καὶ παρακελεύονται οἱ θεοὶ

''...νοεῖν μορφὴν φωτὸς προταθεῖσαν·''

ἄνω γὰρ ἀμόρφωτος οὖσα διὰ τὴν πρόοδον ἐγένετο μεμορφωμένη.

## 146

(p. 57 Kr. = Proclus, *In rem p.*, I, 111, 1-12)

καὶ ταῦτα καὶ ἡ θεοπαράδοτος μυσταγωγία παραδέδοκεν·

''...ταῦτ' (γάρ φησιν) ἐπιφωνήσας ἢ παιδὶ κατόψῃ
πῦρ ἴκελον σκιρτηδὸν ἐπ' ἠέρος οἶδμα τιταῖνον·
ἢ καὶ πῦρ ἀτύπωτον, ὅθεν φωνὴν προθέουσαν·
ἢ φῶς πλούσιον ἀμφὶ γύην ῥοιζαῖον ἐλιχθέν·
ἀλλὰ καὶ ἵππον ἰδεῖν φωτὸς πλέον ἀστράπτοντα
ἢ καὶ παῖδα θοοῖς νώτοις ἐποχούμενον ἵππου,
ἔμπυρον ἢ χρυσῷ πεπυκασμένον ἢ πάλι γυμνόν,
ἢ καὶ τοξεύοντα καὶ ἑστηῶτ' ἐπὶ νώτοις.''

## 147

(p. 57 Kr. = Psellus, *P.G.*, 122, 1133 b 5-8)

''πολλάκις ἦν λέξῃς μοι, ἀθρήσεις πάντα λέοντα.
οὔτε γὰρ οὐράνιος κυρτὸς τότε φαίνεται ὄγκος,
ἀστέρες οὐ λάμπουσι, τὸ μήνης φῶς κεκάλυπται,
χθὼν οὐχ ἕστηκεν· βλέπεται δέ <τε> πάντα κεραυνοῖς.''

## 148

(p. 58 Kr. = Psellus, *P.G.*, 122, 1136 b 11 - c 1)

''ἡνίκα <δὲ> βλέψῃς μορφῆς ἄτερ εὐΐερον πῦρ
λαμπόμενον σκιρτηδὸν ὅλου κατὰ βένθεα κόσμου,
κλῦθι πυρὸς φωνήν.''

## 149

(p. 58 Kr. = Psellus, *P.G.*, 1148 b 14-15; cf. Nicephorus Gregoras, *P.G.*, 149, 540 b 4-5)

''ἡνίκα δαίμονα δ' ἐρχόμενον πρόσγειον ἀθρήσεις,
θῦε λίθον μνίζουριν ἐπαυδῶν...''

### 145

Therefore, even the gods admonish us

> "...to perceive the shape of light which has been stretched forth."

For although it was without shape on high, it has become formed through procession.

### 146

And even the mystical doctrine handed down by the gods imparts these things:

> "...after this invocation, (it says) you will either see a fire, similar to a child, extended by bounds over the billow of air, or you will see a formless fire, from which a voice is sent forth, or you will see a sumptuous light, rushing like a spiral around the field. But you may even see a horse, more dazzling than light, or even a child mounted on the nimble back of a horse, (a child) of fire or covered with gold or, again, a naked (child) or even (a child) shooting a bow and standing on the back (of a horse)."

### 147

> "If you speak to me often, you will perceive everything in lion-form. For neither does the curved mass of heaven appear then nor do the stars shine. The light of the moon is hidden, and the earth is not firmly secured, but everything is seen by flashes of lightning."

### 148

> "But when you see the formless, very holy fire shining by leaps and bounds throughout the depths of the whole world, (then) listen to the voice of the fire."

### 149

> "When you perceive an earthly demon approaching, offer the *mnizouris* stone while making an invocation..."

## 150

(p. 58 Kr. = Psellus, *P.G.*, 122, 1132 c 1-3)

''ὀνόματα βάρβαρα μήποτ' ἀλλάξῃς·''

τοῦτ' ἔστιν· εἰσὶ γὰρ ὀνόματα παρ' ἑκάστοις ἔθνεσι θεοπαράδοτα δύναμιν ἐν ταῖς τελεταῖς ἄρρητον ἔχοντα.

## 151

(p. 58 Kr. = Proclus, *In Eucl.*, 129, 6-8 F.)

διὸ καὶ τὰ λόγια τὰς γωνιακὰς συμβολὰς τῶν σχημάτων

''...συνοχηΐδας...''

ἀποκαλεῖ.

## 152

(p. 19 Kr. = Proclus, *In Crat.*, 59, 1-3; cf. Damascius, II, 43, 23; 59, 18; 148, 11)

ἔστιν γάρ (sc. ὁ ἅπαξ ἐπέκεινα), ὥς φησι τὸ λόγιον

''... ἀμιστύλλευτος...''

καὶ ἑνοειδὴς καὶ ἀδιαίρετος.

## 153

(p. 59 Kr. = Lydus, *De mens.*, II, 10; 31, 16-19 W.)

ταύτῃ (sc. τῇ πεντάδι) τὰς ἀποκαθισταμένας ψυχὰς ὑπερβαίνειν τὴν εἱμαρμένην φησὶ τὸ λόγιον·

''οὐ γὰρ ὑφ' εἱμαρτὴν ἀγέλην πίπτουσι θεουργοί.''

## 154

(p. 59 Kr. = Proclus, *In Alc.*, 113 [245, 6-7 Cr.] W.)

φευκτέον τὸ πλῆθος τῶν ἀνθρώπων τῶν

''...ἀγεληδὸν ἰόντων,''

ὥς φησι τὸ λόγιον.

## 155*

(p. 60 Kr. = *In rem p.*, II, 77, 7-10)

οἷα δὴ καὶ ἡ τῶν παθῶν ἐστιν φύσις, δυσνουθέτητος οὖσα καὶ λόγῳ

''δύσκαμπτος καὶ ὀπισθοβαρὴς καὶ ἄμοιρος,''

ὡς εἰπεῖν λόγου,

''φωτὸς,''

ὄντος.

### 150

"Do not change the *nomina barbara*;"

that is, the names handed down by the gods to each race have ineffable power in the initiation rites.

### 151

Therefore, even the *Oracles* call the angular conjunctions (of Euclid) the

"...Connectors..."

of the figures.

### 152

For (the Once Transcendent), as the oracle says, is

"...without parts..."

simple, and indivisible.

### 153

The souls that are re-established in this (pentad) come under the sway of Destiny, says the oracle:

"For the theurgists do not fall into the herd which is subject to Destiny."

### 154

We must flee the mass of men

"...who are going about in herds,"

as the oracle says.

### 155*

Such also is the nature of the passions, which is disaffected and

"hard to bend"

by reason,

"and weighted from behind, and without a share,"

so to speak, of reason, which is

"light."

## 156

(p. 60 Kr. = Proclus, *In rem p.*, II, 309, 10-11)

''οἵδε γὰρ οὐκ ἀπέχουσι κυνῶν ἀλόγων πολὺ μέτρον,''

οἱ ζῶντες πονηρὰν ζωήν, φησί τὸ λόγιον.

## 157

(p. 60 Kr. = Psellus, *P.G.*, 122, 1140 a 3-6)

''σὸν <δὲ γὰρ> ἀγγεῖον θῆρες χθονὸς οἰκήσουσιν.''

'''Αγγεῖον'' μέν ἐστι τὸ σύνθετον ἡμῶν κρᾶμα τῆς ζωῆς· ''θῆρες'' δὲ ''χθονός,'' οἱ περὶ γῆς καλινδούμενοι δαίμονες.

## 158

(p. 61 Kr. = Synesius, *De insomn.*, 140 c-d; cf. Psellus, *P.G.*, 122, 1125 a 11 = v. 1 + 1124 a 1 = v. 2)

ἀνιούσῃ (sc. τῇ ψυχῇ) δὲ συνέπεται (sc. τὸ πνεῦμα) μέχρις οὗ δύναμις ἔπεσθαι· δύναται δὲ μέχρις ἂν εἰς πλεῖστον τὸ ἀντικείμενον ἥκῃ. ἄκουε γὰρ καὶ περὶ τούτου τῶν λογίων λεγόντων·

''οὐδὲ τὸ τῆς ὕλης σκύβαλον κρημνῷ καταλείψεις,
ἀλλὰ καὶ εἰδώλῳ μερὶς εἰς τόπον ἀμφιφάοντα.''

## 159

(p. 61, n. 3 Kr. = Psellus, *P.G.*, 122, 1141 b 10-11)

''...βίῃ ὅτι σῶμα λιπόντων
ἀνθρώπων ψυχαὶ κατάρατοι...''

## 160

(p. 62 Kr. = Proclus, *In rem p.*, II, 336, 27-337, 3)

ὅτι δὲ παρὰ φύσιν ταῖς ἀνθρωπίναις ψυχαῖς ἡ εἰς τὰ ἄλογα μετάβασις· οὐ τὰ λόγια μόνον διδάσκει λέγοντα

''θεσμὸν ἀπαὶ μακάρων...(εἶναι τοῦτον) ἄλυτον...''

τὴν ἀνθρωπίνην ψυχήν

''αὖτις ἐπ' ἀνθρώπων περάαν βίον, οὐκ ἐπὶ θηρῶν.''

## 161

(p. 62 Kr. = Psellus, *P.G.*, 122, 1141 a 1)

''...ποιναὶ μερόπων ἄγχτειραι.''

### 156

"For they do not differ in great measure from dogs without reason,"

says the oracle of those who lead a wicked life.

### 157

"<For> earthly beasts will occupy your vessel."

The "vessel" is the composite mixture of our life; the "earthly beasts" are those demons who roam about the earth.

### 158

(The pneuma) accompanies the ascending (soul) as far as it can follow; and it is able (to follow) until it has come to the farthest opposite place. For also listen to what the *Oracles* say about this:

"And you will not leave behind the dregs of matter on a precipice, but there is also a portion for the image in the place surrounded with light."

### 159

"...because the souls of men who have left the body by force are accursed..."

### 160

Because it is against nature for human souls to pass into irrational (animals). The *Oracles* are not the only ones to teach this when they say that it is an

"indissoluble law from the blessed ones..."

that the human soul

"passes over again to a human life and not to the life of beasts."

### 161

"...avengers, stranglers of men..."

## 162

(p. 63 Kr. = Psellus, *P.G.*, 122, 1145 b 11)

''ἄ ἄ τούσδε κατωρύεται χθὼν ἐς τέκνα μέχρις.''

## 163

(p. 62 Kr. = Damascius, II, 317, 1-7; cf. Synesius, *De insomn.*, 138 c-d = vv. 1-3)

οἱ θεοὶ περὶ τοῦδε τοῦ κόσμου οὐ τὰ αὐτὰ χρησμῳδοῦσιν;

''μηδὲ κάτω νεύσῃς εἰς τὸν μελαναυγέα κόσμον,
ᾧ βυθὸς αἰὲν ἄμορφος ὑπέστρωται καὶ ἀειδής,
ἀμφικνεφὴς ῥυπόων εἰδωλοχαρὴς ἀνόητος
κρημνώδης σκολιὸς πηρὸν βάθος αἰὲν ἑλίσσων,
αἰεὶ νυμφεύων ἀφανὲς δέμας ἀργὸν ἄπνευμον.''

## 164

(p. 63 Kr. = Psellus, *P.G.*, 122, 1132 b 1-2)

''μηδὲ κάτω νεύσῃς· κρημνὸς κατὰ γῆς ὑπόκειται,
ἑπταπόρου σύρων κατὰ βαθμίδος...''

## 165*

(p. 65, n. 1 Kr. = Psellus, *P.G.*, 122, 1137 d 5-8)

''ζήτησον παράδεισον...''

Παράδεισός ἐστι Χαλδαϊκὸς πᾶς ὁ περὶ τὸν πατέρα χορὸς τῶν θειῶν δυνάμεων καὶ τὰ ἐμπύρια κάλλη τῶν δημιουργικῶν πηγῶν.

## 166*

(p. 5 Kr. = Psellus, *P.G.*, 122, 1125 d 1-4; cf. Plotinus, *Enn.* I.9 *init.*)

''...μὴ ᾽ξάξῃς, ἵνα μή τι ἔχουσα
ἐξίῃ...''

Τοῦτο τὸ λόγιον καὶ Πλωτῖνος ἐν τῷ περὶ ἀλόγου ἐξαγωγῆς τίθησιν.

## 167

(p. 65 Kr. = Proclus, *In Eucl.*, 154, 27-155, 5 F.)

ὃ καὶ τὸ μαθηματικὸν κέντρον ἀποτυποῦται, πάσας τὰς ἀφ᾽ ἑαυτοῦ πρὸς τὴν περιφέρειαν γραμμὰς περατοῦν καὶ τὴν ἰσότητα αὐταῖς εἰκόνα τῆς οἰκείας ἑνώσεως παρέχον. οὕτω δὲ καὶ τὰ λόγια ''τὸ κέντρον'' ἀφορίζεται·

''κέντρον, ἀφ᾽ οὗ πᾶσαι μέχρις ἄντυγος ἶσαι ἔασιν.''

### 162

"Ha! Ha! The earth howls at them up to the time of their children."

### 163

Don't the gods prophesy the same things about this world?

"Do not stoop below into the dark-gleaming world beneath which an abyss is spread, forever formless and invisible, dark all around, foul, delighting in images, without reason, precipitous, twisted, forever revolving around its maimed depth, forever wedded to an invisible shape, idle, without breath."

### 164

"Do not stoop below. A precipice lies beneath the earth, drawing (the soul) down from the staircase of seven steps."

### 165*

"Seek paradise..."

The Chaldean paradise is the entire chorus of divine powers around the Father and the empyrean beauties of the demiurgic Principles.

•

### 166*

"...do not release (the soul), lest it come forth possessing something (evil)..."

Plotinus also places this oracle in (his tractate) concerning irrational release.

### 167

This is what the mathematical center typifies, since it is the termination point for all the lines (which proceed) from it to the circumference, and presents equality to them as the image of its own unity. It is in this way that the *Oracles* define "the center:"

"Center, from which all things are equal up to the rim."

## 168

(p. 36 Kr. = Proclus, *In Crat.*, 96, 16-18)

ὁ δὲ (sc.'Απόλλων) τὰς ἡλιακὰς ἀρχὰς εἰς μίαν ἕνωσιν ἐπιστρέφει

"...κατέχων τὴν τρίπτερον ἀρχήν,"

ὡς τὸ λόγιόν φησι.

## 169

(p. 16 Kr. = Proclus, *In Crat.*, 59, 19-21; cf. 52, 1-3)

αἱ δὲ θεοπαράδοτοι φῆμαι τὴν θεότητα ταύτην τῷ "ἅπαξ" χαρακτηρίζουσιν λέγουσαι

"...ἅπαξ ἐπέκεινα,"

τὸ γὰρ "ἅπαξ" τῷ ἑνὶ συγγενές.

## 170

(p. 65 Kr. = Proclus, *In Tim.*, I, 121, 21-24)

τί δέ, εἰ ὄρη συμπέσοι πνεύματος αὐτὰ ῥήξαντος ἀπὸ τῶν ὑπογείων τόπων, ὑφ' οἵου τὰ λόγια καὶ

"αὐτάνδρους πόλεάς γ' ἀπολέσθαι..."

φησίν.

## 171*

(e Proclo, *Exc. chald.*, I; p. 193, 15-16 Pitra)

πατὴρ ὁδηγεῖ, πυρὸς ὁδοὺς ἀναπτύξας

"μηδέ ποτ' ἐκ λήθης ῥεύσωμεν χεῦμα ταπεινόν."

## 172*

(p. 63 Kr. = e Proclo, *In Tim.*, III, 325, 32-326, 2)

καὶ τὸ λάβρον τῆς ὕλης...

"ἧς κατασύρονται πολλοὶ σκολιοῖσι ῥεέθροις,"

ὡς τὰ λόγιά φησιν.

## 173*

(p. 10, n. 1 Kr. = Lydus, *De mens.*, II, 11; 32, 1-4 W.)

'Αφροδίτην δὲ ἄν τις εἴποι...

"...τὴν πρωτογενῆ ὕλην..."

ἣν καὶ ἀστερίαν καὶ οὐρανίαν καλεῖ τὰ λόγια.

## 168

But (Apollo) turns the solar Principles around into a single combination,

"...holding fast the three-winged Principle,"

as the oracle says.

## 169

But the *Oracles* handed down from the gods characterize this Divinity in terms of "Once," saying

"...Once Transcendent,"

for that which is "Once" is akin to the One.

## 170

But what if the mountains should fall when the wind bursts them from the subterranean places, by which (action) the *Oracles* say that

"cities, men and all, are destroyed..."

## 171*

The Father guides us, opening paths of fire,

"so that we do not flow into a wretched stream from forgetfulness."

## 172*

And the turbulence of matter...

"...by which many are pulled down into twisted streams,"

as the *Oracles* say.

## 173*

Someone says that Aphrodite is...

"...primordial matter..."

which the *Oracles* call both starry and heavenly.

## 174*

(Hermias, *In Phaedrum*, 110, 3-6 C.)

δῆλον οὖν ὅτι ἑαυτῇ ἂν παρέχοι τὴν κίνησιν· αὐτοκίνητος ἄρα ἐστίν.

''ἡ δ' ἑτέροις παρέχει τὸ ζῆν, πολὺ μᾶλλον ἑαυτῇ,''

φησὶ τὰ λόγια.

## 175

(p. 13, n. 1 Kr. = e Proclo, *Exc. chald.*, IV; 194, 31-32 Pitra)

περὶ τοῦ πρωτίστου πατρὸς ἐν ἄλλοις εἴρηται·

''καὶ δύναμιν πρώτην ἱεροῦ λόγου...''

## 176

(Damascius, *Vita Isidori*, § 137, p. 115 Zintzen = *Suda*, IV, 650, 30 Adler, s.v. ὑπερβάθμιον)

οὐδὲ

''...ὑπερβάθμιον πόδα ῥιπτῶν,''

κατὰ τὸ λόγιον.

## 177*

(p. 43 Kr. = Damascius, I, 290, 15-17)

λείπεται ἄρα τὸν συνοχικὸν διάκοσμον ἅμα τῷ τελεταρχικῷ ποιεῖν τὸν μέσον. Καὶ τίς ἡ τοῦ μέσου τριάς; ἣ

''...οἱ μὲν τελετάρχαι
τοῖς συνοχεῦσι συνείληνται...''

κατὰ τὸ λόγιον.

## 178*

(e Proclo, *In Tim.*, III, 14, 14-15)

ἀλλὰ ταῦτα μὲν <ἐν>

''...ἀβάτοις σηκοῖς (τῆς) διανοίας''

ἀνελίττω.

## 179

(p. 18 Kr. = Damascius, II, 58, 20-21)

ἐροῦμεν τὴν νοητὴν τὸ μὲν

''...πάσης τμήσιος ἄρχειν,''

κατὰ τὸ λόγιον.

## 174*

It is clear, therefore, that she provides movement to herself; consequently, she is self-moved.

"To others she provides life; to herself, far more,"

say the *Oracles*.

## 175

Concerning the Very First Father it is said, among other things:

"And First Power of the sacred word..."

## 176

And not

"...throwing the feet beneath the step,"

according to the oracle.

## 177*

It remains, then, to make a median of the connective order together with the teletarchic order. And what is the triad of this median?

"...the Teletarchs assist the Connectors,"

according to the oracle.

## 178*

But these matters I interpret <in>

"...the inaccessible recesses of (the) mind."

## 179

We say that the Intelligible is the

"...Source of every division,"

according to the oracle.

## 180*

(p. 63 Kr. = Proclus, *In Tim.*, III, 325, 29-32)

πᾶσαν τὴν γενεσιουργὸν φύσιν, ἐν ᾗ...

"τῆς ὕλης ὁ λάβρον..."

## 181*

(p. 63 Kr. = Proclus, *In Tim.*, III, 325, 29-326, 1)

πᾶσαν τὴν γενεσιουργὸν φύσιν, ἐν ᾗ...

"...ὁ μισοφαὴς κόσμος..."

ὡς οἱ θεοὶ λέγουσι.

## 182

(p. 27 Kr. = Damascius, II, 45, 10-12)

Διὰ τοῦτο, οἶμαι, καὶ ἐφάνησαν ἐν αὐτῇ (sc. τῇ μέσῃ τάξει τῶν νοερῶν) ἥ τε ἀρετὴ καὶ ἡ σοφία, καὶ

"...ἡ πολύφρων ἀτρεκεία,"

κατὰ τὸ λόγιον.

## 183*

(Lydus, *De mens.*, IV, 107; 147, 4-6 W.)

κατὰ γὰρ τὸ λόγιον

"...τὸ δ' ἀτρεκὲς ἐν βαθεῖ ἐστι."

## 184

(p. 33, n. 1 Kr. = Psellus, *P.G.*, 122, 1152, c 3-4)

καὶ ἄλλος (sc. κύκλος) μὲν παρ' αὐτοῖς (sc. τοῖς Χαλδαίοις) ὁ ἡλιακὸς κόσμος τῷ

"δουλεύων βάθει αἰθερίῳ..."

## 185

(p. 33 Kr. = Proclus, *In Tim.*, III, 36, 20-22; cf. 55, 30-31)

ὁ ἀληθέστερος ἥλιος συμμετρεῖ τῷ χρόνῳ τὰ πάντα

"...χρόνου χρόνος..."

ὧν ἀτεχνῶς κατὰ τὴν περὶ αὐτοῦ τῶν θεῶν ὁμφήν.

## 180*

The entire generative nature...in which there exists...

"...the turbulence of matter..."

## 181*

The entire generative nature...in which there exists...

"...the light-hating world..."

as the gods say.

## 182

For this reason, I believe, virtue and wisdom are manifested in it (sc. the median order of intellectuals) and

"...thoughtful reality."

according to the oracle.

## 183*

For according to the oracle,

"...the real is in the depth."

## 184

And another (circle), according to them (sc. the Chaldeans), is the solar world which

"serves the Ethereal depth..."

## 185

The truer sun measures the All together with Time, truly being

"...Time of Time..."

according to the oracle of the gods on this subject.

## 186

(p. 48 Kr. = Proclus, *In rem p.*, II, 95, 9-11)

ὁ δὲ τῆς Λήθης ποταμὸς πᾶσαν τὴν ῥύσιν τῶν ἐνύλων καὶ τὸ

"...ῥόθιον κύτος ἡμῶν."

## 186 *bis*

(Olympiodorus, *In Phaedonem*, 77 [23, 3-4 N.] W.; cf. 157 [68, 23-24 N.] W.; *In Alc.*, 125 [198, 23-24 Cr.] W.)

διότι (sc. ἡ ψυχή)

"...πάμμορφον ἄγαλμα..."

ἐστι πάντων τῶν ὄντων ἔχουσα λόγους.

## 186

The river of Forgetfulness (signifies) all the flowing of material things and

"...our rushing vessel."

## 186 *bis*

Since (the soul) is

"...a multiformed image..."

which possesses the Principles of all that exists.

# VARIOUS CHALDEAN EXPRESSIONS

## 187*

(Proclus, *Th. pl.*, 264, 19-21 Portus)

ἀγήραος

τῶν δὲ θεολόγων τὸ ''ἀγήρων'' τῇ τάξει ταύτῃ προσήκειν λεγόντων, ὡς οἵ τε βάρβαροί φασι, καὶ ὁ τῶν Ἑλλήνων θεολόγος Ὀρφεύς.

## 188*

(p. 46 Kr. = Proclus, *In Parm.*, 647, 6-7 Co.[2]; cf. *In Tim.*, III, 43, 13)

ἄζωνος

οἷα τὰ τοῖς Ἀσσυρίοις ὑμνημένα, ζῶναι καὶ ''ἄζωνοι'' καὶ πηγαὶ καὶ ἀμείλικτοι καὶ συνοχεῖς.

## 189

(p. 30, n. 1 Kr. = Proclus, *In Tim.*, II, 130, 23-28)

ἀμφιπρόσωπος

ἀμφιφανὴς καὶ ''ἀμφιπρόσωπος'' οὖσα...ὑποδεχομένη δὲ τοῖς ἑαυτῆς κόλποις τὰς ἀπὸ τῶν νοητῶν προόδους...προϊεμένη δὲ καὶ αὐτὴ τοὺς ὀχετοὺς τῆς σωματοειδοῦς ζωῆς καὶ συνέχουσα τὸ κέντρον τῆς προόδου τῶν ὄντων ἁπάντων ἐν ἑαυτῇ.

## 190*

(p. 53 Kr. = Proclus, *In Alc.*, 87 [188, 11-15 Cr.] W.)

ἀναγωγός

ὅτι δὲ καὶ παρὰ τῶν κρειττόνων ἐγγίνεταί τις ἡμῖν γνῶσις τῶν πραγμάτων, αἱ τῶν θεῶν αὐτοφίαι καὶ ὑφηγήσεις ἱκανῶς δηλοῦσιν, ἐκφαίνουσαι μὲν τὴν τάξιν τῶν ὅλων ταῖς ψυχαῖς, προκαθηγούμεναι δὲ τῆς πρὸς τὸ νοητὸν πορείας καὶ τοὺς πυρσοὺς ἀνάπτουσαι τοὺς ''ἀναγωγούς.''

## 191

(p. 40 Kr. = Proclus, *In Crat.*, 67, 19-20; cf. 74, 26)

ἄφθεγκτος

καὶ γὰρ τὰ λόγια περὶ ἐκείνων ὡς ''ἀφθέγκτων'' ἐνεδείξατο.

## VARIOUS CHALDEAN EXPRESSIONS

### 187*

### Unageing

Since the theologians say that "unageing" is proper to this order, as the *barbaroi* say, and the Greek theologian, Orpheus.

### 188*

### Independent of Zones

Such (names) as are celebrated by the Assyrians—Zones, "Independent of Zones," Sources, Implacables, and Connectors.

### 189

### Faces on all Sides

And she is visible on all sides and has "faces on all sides"...receiving in her womb the processions from the intelligibles...and she sends forth the channels of corporeal life and contains within herself the center of the procession of all beings.

### 190*

### Leading Upward

That a certain knowledge of the way of things is engendered within us by superior beings, is adequately revealed by the *autoptic* manifestations and guidance of the gods, which disclose the order of the universe to souls, guide our journey to the Intelligible, and kindle the fires that "lead upward."

### 191

### Ineffable

For the *Oracles* concerning them point out that they are "ineffable."

## 192

(Simplicius, *In phys.*, 615, 6-7)

ἔνυλος

ὁ οὐρανὸς...καὶ ὑπὸ τῶν λογίων ὡς ''ἔνυλος'' παραδέδοται.

## 193

(Proclus, *In Tim.*, II, 144, 27-30)

ἐποχεῖσθαι

ἐπεὶ τοῖς γε ἀπὸ τῶν λογίων ὡρμημένοις καὶ ἐκεῖναι αἱ ψυχαὶ (sc. ὑπερκοσμίοι) σώμασιν ''ἐποχεῖσθαι'' ῥηθήσονται ὑπερκοσμίοις τισίν, αἰθερίοις καὶ ἐμπυρίοις.

## 194

(p. 17 Kr. = Julian, *Or.* V, 172d-173a; cf. Proclus, *In Tim.*, I, 34, 21)

ἑπτάκτις

εἰ δὲ καὶ τῆς ἀρρήτου μυσταγωγίας ἀψαίμην, ἣν ὁ Χαλδαῖος περὶ τὸν ''ἑπτάκτινα'' θεὸν ἐβάκχευσεν, ἀνάγων δι' αὐτοῦ τὰς ψυχάς, ἄγνωστα ἐρῶ, καὶ μάλα γε ἄγνωστα τῷ συρφετῷ, θεουργοῖς δὲ τοῖς μακαρίοις γνώριμα.

## 195*

(p. 46 Kr. = Proclus, *In Tim.*, III, 43, 12-13)

ζωναῖος

ἀλλὰ τὸν χρόνον αὐτὸν ὑμνήκασιν (sc. οἱ θεουργοί) ὡς θεόν, καὶ ἄλλον μὲν τὸν ''ζωναῖον''...ἄλλον δὲ ἄζωνον.

## 196

(p. 53 Kr. = Proclus, *In Tim.*, III, 300, 16-20)

κηλίς

τὸ δὲ μέγιστον...ἡ τελεστικὴ συμβάλλεται, διὰ τοῦ θείου πυρὸς ἀφανίζουσα τὰς ἐκ τῆς γενέσεως ἁπάσας ''κηλῖδας,'' ὡς τὰ λόγια διδάσκει, καὶ πᾶσαν τὴν ἀλλότριον ἣν ἐφειλκύσατο τῆς ψυχῆς τὸ πνεῦμα καὶ ἀλόγιστον φύσιν.

## 197

(p. 65 Kr. = Damascius, II, 126, 22-23)

κλείς

διὸ καὶ ἑκατέρα (sc. διαίρεσις) ''κλεὶς'' ἀνυμνεῖται ὑπ' αὐτῶν τῶν θεῶν.

## 192

### Implicated in Matter

And it is handed down by the *Oracles* that the sky is "implicated in matter."

## 193

### To be Vehicled

Since for those who are inspired by the *Oracles*, even these (supermundane) souls are said "to be vehicled" to certain supermundane bodies which are both Ethereal and Empyrean.

## 194

### Seven-Rayed

But if I should touch upon the ineffable, mystical doctrine which the Chaldean spoke in a divine frenzy concerning the "seven-rayed" god—that god through whom he causes souls to ascend—I would be saying unknowable things. Yes, certainly unknowable to the herd, but well-known to the blessed theurgists.

## 195*

### Linked to the Zones

But (the theurgists) have praised Time itself as a god, and one (Time god) (they praise) as "Linked to the Zones"...the other as Independent of the Zones.

## 196

### Defilement

The telestic (life) contributes the most by removing, through divine fire, all the "defilements" attendant upon generation, as the *Oracles* teach, and all the alien and irrational nature which the soul's pneumatic (vehicle) has drawn to it.

## 197

### Key

Hence, each (division) is praised as "key" by the gods themselves.

## 198*

(p. 18, n. 2 Kr. = Proclus, *In Tim.*, I, 430, 6-7)

### κρύφιος

οὕτως ὁ ''κρύφιος'' διάκοσμος ἑνοειδῶς περιέχει πᾶν τὸ νοητόν.

## 199*

(Proclus, *In Tim.*, III, 20, 22-26)

### κυκλοέλικτος

οἱ θεουργοὶ...ὑμνοῦσι πρεσβύτερον καὶ νεώτερον καὶ ''κυκλοέλικτον'' <τοῦτον> τὸν θεὸν (sc. τὸν χρόνον) καὶ αἰώνιον.

## 200*

(p. 39 Kr. = Proclus, *In Tim.*, III, 132, 32-33; cf. 63, 23; *In rem p.*, II, 220, 12)

### μεσεμβολεῖν

περὶ δὲ τῶν πλανωμένων, ὅτι ἓξ αὐτοὺς ὑπέστησεν ἕβδομον ἡλίου ''μεσεμβολήσας'' πῦρ.

## 201

(p. 47 Kr. = Proclus, *In Tim.*, I, 5, 3-5)

### ὄχημα

ψυχαὶ μερικαὶ...ἐγκόσμιαι γίνονται κατὰ τὰ ''ὀχήματα'' τὰ ἑαυτῶν.

## 202

(p. 52, n. 2 Kr. = Proclus, *Exc. chald.*, I; 192, 12-14 Pitra)

### πανδεκτικὴ αὐλή

καὶ ἡ ''πανδεκτικὴ αὐλὴ'' τοῦ πατρὸς ἡ πατρικὴ τάξις ἐστίν, ἡ πάσας ὑποδεχομένη καὶ συνέχουσα τὰς ἀναθείσας ψυχάς.

## 203*

(pp. 22-23 Kr. = Damascius, II, 88, 21-22; cf. 87, 9; Psellus, *Hypotyp.*, 28; 76, 2 K.)

### σειρά

ἔστιν τῶν στερεωμάτων ''σειρὰ'' τὸ ἐμπύριον, καὶ αἰθέριον καὶ ὑλαῖον.

## 198*

### Hidden

Thus, the "hidden" order singly encloses the entire intelligible order.

## 199*

### Unrolled in a Circle

The theurgists...praise this god (sc. Chronos) as older, younger, "unrolled in a circle," and eternal.

## 200*

### To Intercalate

Regarding the planets, (Julian the Theurgist says) that (God) established them as six, "intercalating" the fire of the sun as the seventh.

## 201

### Vehicle

Particular souls...become mundane through their "vehicles."

## 202

### Court Open to All

And the "court open to all" is the paternal order of the Father, which welcomes and contains all the souls which have returned on high.

## 203*

### Chain

There is a "chain" of firmaments—the Empyrean, Ethereal, and Material.

## 204

(p. 48 Kr. = Proclus, *In rem p.*, II, 335, 29-336, 2)

σκίδνασθαι

τῆς (sc. ψυχῆς) ἐν κατατάξει διὰ τὴν ἐν τῷ σώματι τῷ ''σκιδναμένῳ'' κατάταξιν αὐτῆς ἑαυτὴν συνέχειν ἀσθενούσης.

## 205*

(pp. 31-32 Kr.; see fr. 57 for context)

στερεώματα

## 206

(p. 41, n. 2 Kr. = Psellus, *P.G.*, 122, 1133 a 4 + 12-14; cf. Marinus, *Vita Procli*, 28 = p. 22, 24 Boissonade; Nicephorus Gregoras, *P.G.*, 149, 540 b 11)

στρόφαλος

''ἐνέργει περὶ τὸν Ἑκατικὸν στρόφαλον.''

...Διδάσκει οὖν τὴν τελετὴν ἐνεργεῖν, ἤτοι τὴν κίνησιν τοῦ τοιούτου στροφάλου, ὡς δύναμιν ἀπόρρητον ἔχουσαν.

## 207

(p. 19 Kr. = Proclus, *In Crat.*, 59, 1-3; cf. Damascius, II, 148, 12-13)

συνοχεύς

ἔστιν γάρ, ὥς φησι τὸ λόγιον...πασῶν ''συνοχεὺς'' τῶν πηγῶν.

## 208*

(Marinus, *Vita Procli*, 28 = p. 22, 23-24 Boissonade; cf. Damascius, *In Phaedonem*, 101 (121, 1-2 N.) W.)

σύστασις

ταῖς γὰρ τῶν Χαλδαίων ''συστάσεσι'' καὶ ἐντυχίαις καὶ τοῖς θείοις καὶ ἀφθέγκτοις στροφάλοις ἐκέχρητο.

## 209*

(p. 39 Kr.; see fr. 59, introduction, for context)

ὑπερκόσμιος

## 204

### To be Scattered

Since (the soul), in its coordination, is too weak to sustain itself because of its coordination with a body that "is scattered."

## 205*

### Firmaments

(See fr. 57 for context.)

## 206

### Magic Wheel

"Operate with the magic wheel of Hecate."

...Therefore (the oracle) teaches how to operate the rite, truly the movement of such a magic wheel, since it has ineffable power.

## 207

### Connector

For he is, as the oracle says...the "Connector" of all the Sources.

## 208*

### Conjunction

For (Proclus) made use of the "conjunctions," prayers, and the divine, ineffable, magic wheels of the Chaldeans.

## 209*

### Supermundane

(See fr. 59, introduction, for context.)

## 210*

(p. 66 Kr. = Proclus, *In Crat.*, 35, 2-5)

χαλκίς...κύμινδις

ἡ δὲ ''χαλκὶς'' διὰ τὸ λιγυρὸν καὶ εὔηχον δίκην χαλκοῦ ἠχοῦντος τορὸν οὕτως ἐκλήθη· ἀμέλει καὶ Χαλδαῖοι οὕτως αὐτὸ καλοῦσι παρὰ θεῶν ἀκούσαντες· ἡ δὲ ''κύμινδις'' παρὰ τὴν σμικρότητα τοῦ ὀρνεοῦ.

## 210a

(Lydus, *De mens.*, IV, 120; 158, 10-12 W.)

μαλάχης ἀπέχεσθαι

κατὰ δὲ τὸν Αὔγουστον μῆνα ''μαλάχης ἀπέχεσθαι'' τοῖς γε βουλομένοις ὑγιαίνειν τὰ ἄρθρα τὸ λόγιον θεσπίζει.

## 210b

(Lydus, *De mens.*, IV, 134; 161, 18-19)

γαλακτοποτεῖν

τὸ δὲ λόγιον ἀνὰ πάντα τὸν Σεπτέμβριον μῆνα ''γαλακτοποτεῖν'' ὑπερ ὑγείας παρεγγυᾷ.

## 210c

(Proclus, *In Crat.*, 101, 26-28)

χείρ

συνδιακοσμεῖ δὲ πᾶν τὸ αἰσθητὸν ταῖς δημιουργικαῖς αὐτοῦ δυνάμεσιν, ἃς δὴ θεουργῶν παῖδες ''χεῖρας'' ἀποκαλοῦσιν.

## 210*

### Chalcis...Kumindis

The "chalcis" is so called because of the clear and sharp, tuneful manner of the clanging brass. No doubt the Chaldeans called it this because they heard it from the gods. And the "kumindis" is among the smallest of birds.

## 210a

### To Refrain from Mallow

The oracle advises those who wish to keep their joints healthy "to refrain from mallow" during the month of August.

## 210b

### To Drink Milk

The oracle encourages us "to drink milk" for our health during the entire month of September.

## 210c

### Hand

He sets in order the entire sense-perceptible (world) through his demiurgic powers, which the sons of the theurgists call "hands."

# DOUBTFUL FRAGMENTS

## 211*

(p. 9 Kr. = Proclus, *In rem p.*, I, 111, 28-112, 1)

''οὐ φέρει με τοῦ δοχῆος ἡ τάλαινα καρδία,''

φησίν τις θεῶν.

## 212*

(p. 58, n. 1 Kr. = Psellus, *P.G.*, 122, 1145 b 1)

''ἃ δὴ λέγει νοῦς, τῷ νοεῖν δήπου λέγει.''

## 213*

(Didymus, *De Trinitate*, III, 21; *P.G.*, 39, 904 b)

Διὸ καὶ οἱ ἔξω παραγγέλλουσι περὶ τῆς ἐμπλήκτου ἀνοίας·

''φεῦγε τάχος χθονίων παθέων ἄπο, τηλόσε φεῦγε,
ψυχῆς ὄμμα φέριστον ἔχων καὶ ἀκλινέας αὐγάς,
σώματος ὡς ἀνέχοιτο μέγα βρίθοντα χαλινὰ
ἐκ καθαρῆς ψυχῆς τε καὶ αἰθερίης πατρὸς αἴγλης.''

## 214*

(Didymus, *De Trinitate*, III, 28; *P.G.*, 39, 945 c-d)

ἔφασαν (sc. οἱ ἔξω) γάρ·

''πάντα γὰρ ἀνθρώποισι θεοῦ πέλει ἀγλαὰ δῶρα·
εἴτ' ἀγαθόν τι πέφυκε καὶ ὄλβιον, εἴ τι φέριστον,
εἴ τι ἐραστόν, πᾶσι θεοῦ καλὰ δῶρα τέτυκται.''

καὶ πάλιν·

''κάρτος ἀμετρήτοιο θεοῦ καὶ ἀπείριτος ἀλκὴ
παντῶν μὲν κρατέει, πάντεσσι δὲ μοῦνος ἀνάσσει.''

## 215*

(Lydus, *De mens.*, IV, 101; 141, 1-11 W.)

ὅτι ὁ χρησμός φησι·

''δοιοὶ δαίμονές εἰσι κατ' ἀνέρα· δοιὰ δὲ τούτων
ἔθνεα· οἳ κατὰ γαῖαν ἀεῖ τεθαλυῖαν ἀλῶνται

## DOUBTFUL FRAGMENTS

### 211*

"The wretched heart of the recipient does not support me," says one of the gods.

### 212*

"Those things which Intellect says, it doubtless says by thinking."

### 213*

Therefore, even the pagans warn about impulsive mindlessness:

> "Flee swiftly from earthly passions, flee far away, you who possess the superior eye of the soul and the steadfast rays, so that the great, heavy reins of the body might be held in check by a pure soul and the ethereal radiance of the Father."

### 214*

For (the pagans) have said:

> "All splendid gifts come to mankind from God, whether He has produced something good and happy, or something excellent, or something lovely. Beautiful gifts from God are prepared for all."

And again:

> "The power of an immeasurable God and (his) limitless strength hold sway over all things, and He rules alone over everything."

### 215*

Because the oracle says:

> "There are two demons according to men, and of these, there are two races. Those who roam over the ever flourishing earth

παρμίμνειν μερόπεσσι <τεταγμένοι> ἐκ Διὸς ἀρχῆς.
Ζεὺς γάρ τοι δωτὴρ πάντων ἀγαθῶν τε κακῶν τε,
ὃς καὶ τικτομένοισι χρόνον ζωῆς ἀφορίζει,
καμμίξας φαύλοισι καλοῖσί τε σῶμα βρότειον.
κείνους δαίμονας ὅστις ἐῇ σοφίῃ προσέλοιτο,
γνώμην τε σχοίη, ποίοις χαίρουσιν ἐν ἔργοις,
πάντων ἂν προφέροιτο νόῳ καὶ πράξεσιν ἐσθλαῖς
ἐσθλὰ παρ' ἐσθλοῦ δῶρα φέρων καὶ φαῦλα προφεύγων.''

## 216*

(p. 10 Kr. = Lydus, *De mens.*, III, 8; 41, 7-13 W.)

ὅτι ἡ σελήνη προσεχῶς ἐπιβέβηκε τῷ γεννητῷ παντὶ καὶ πάντα κυβερνᾶται τὰ τῇδε ἐναργῶς ὑπ' αὐτῆς, ὡς τὰ λόγιά φασι·

''νύμφαι πηγαῖαι καὶ ἐνύδρια πνεύματα πάντα
καὶ χθόνιοι κόλποι <τε> καὶ ἠέριοι καὶ ὕπαυγοι
μηναῖοι πάσης ἐπιβήτορες ἠδ' ἐπιβῆται
ὕλης οὐρανίας τε καὶ ἀστερίας καὶ ἀβύσσου.''

## 217*

(Proclus, *In rem p.*, II, 126, 14-26)

δηλοῖ δὲ καὶ τὸ λόγιον ταῦτα διδάσκον·

''πάσας μὲν γὰρ ἔχει γλυκερὸς πόθος, ὥς κεν Ὄλυμπον
ἀθανάτοισι θεοῖσι συνέμποροι αἰὲν ἔχωσιν·
οὐ πάσαις δὲ θεμίστ' ἐπιβῆναι τῶνδε μελάθρων.''

εἶτα τοῦ λαμβάνοντος τοὺς χρησμοὺς διὰ πλειόνων ἐκδοθέντας ἐρομένου, τίς οὖν ἐστιν ὁ τυγχάνων τῆς εἰς θεοὺς ἀνόδου, καὶ εἰ ὁ τὸν θυτικὸν βίον μάλιστα προστησάμενος, ἐπάγει πάλιν ὁ θεός·

''οὐχ ὅστις σπλάγχνοισιν ἐπίφρονα θήκατο βουλὴν
ἤδη καὶ πρὸς Ὄλυμπον ἀποσκεδάσας τόδε σῶμα
ἦξεν ἀειρόμενος ψυχῆς κούφαις πτερύγεσσιν,
ἀλλ' ὅστις σο[φός ἐστι...]''

## 218*

(p. 58 Kr. = Synesius, *De insomn.*, 151 c-d)

''ἦ μάλα δὴ κεῖναί γε μακάρταται ἔξοχα πασῶν
ψυχάων ποτὶ γαῖαν ἀπ' οὐρανόθεν προχέονται·
κεῖναι δ' ὄλβισταί τε καὶ οὐ φατὰ νήματ' ἔχουσαι,

> <are commanded> by the sovereignty of Zeus to assist men. For Zeus is the dispenser of all goods and evils. He is the one who determines the length of life for those who are brought into the world and who mixes the mortal body with both worthless and valuable things. Whoever in his wisdom would conciliate these demons and know what works please them, would excel all others in understanding and noble deeds, bearing noble gifts from a noble (benefactor) and fleeing common things."

## 216*

Because the moon, in a proximate way, presides over all of generation and clearly governs all things there by herself, as the *Oracles* say:

> "Nymphs of the springs and all water spirits; hollows of the earth, air, and beneath the solar rays; male and female lunar riders of all matter—heavenly, stellar, and fathomless."

## 217*

And it is clear that the oracle teaches these things:

> "A sweet desire takes hold of all (souls) to dwell forever on Olympus as companions of the immortal gods. But not all are permitted to set foot in these halls."

When the person who had received the oracle, which had been delivered to him most fully, asked who it was, then, who achieved the ascent to the gods, and if it was the individual who especially preferred the life of the haruspex, the god added further:

> "It is not whoever has thoughtfully placed his intention on the entrails (of sacrificial victims) who will immediately go to Olympus after the dissolution of the body, rising aloft on the light wings of the soul, but whoever [is wise...]"

## 218*

> "Ah! Indeed! They are exceedingly, nay, eminently, the most blessed of all souls who pour themselves forth from heaven onto earth. But most blessed are those who possess an

ὅσσαι ἀπ' αἰγλήεντος, ἄναξ, σέθεν, ἠδὲ καὶ αὐτοῦ
ἐκ Διὸς ἐξεγένοντο, μίτου κρατερῆς ὑπ' ἀνάγης.''

καὶ τοῦτ' ἄρα ἦν, ὅπερ ἠνίξατο Τίμαιος, διδοὺς ἑκάστῃ ψυχῇ σύννομον ἄστρον.

## 219*

(Eusebius, *P.E.*, V, 8, 3-4 = Wolff, pp. 155-156; cf. Nicephorus Gregoras, *P.G.*, 149, 604 a-b; N. Terzaghi, *S.I.F.C.*, XII, 1904, p. 191)

πάντες γὰρ δι' ἀνάγκην φασὶν ἁφῖχθαι, οὐχ ἁπλῶς δέ, ἀλλ' οἷον, εἰ χρὴ οὕτω φάναι, πειθανάγκην. εἴρηται δ' ἐν τοῖς ἔμπροσθεν ἐκεῖνα τὰ τῆς Ἑκάτης, δι' ὧν φησιν ἐπιφαίνειν·

''ἠέριον μετὰ φέγγος ἀπείριτον ἀστεροπληθὲς
ἄχραντον πολὺ δῶμα θεοῦ λίπον, ἠδ' ἐπιβαίνω
γαίης ζωοτρόφοιο τεῆς ὑποθημοσύνῃσι
πειθοῖ τ' ἀρρήτων ἐπέων, οἷς δὴ φρένα τέρπειν
ἀθανάτων ἔαδε θνητὸς βροτός...''

## 220*

(Eusebius, *P.E.*, V, 8, 7 = Wolff, p. 158; cf. Theodoretus, *Gr. aff. cur.*, X, 22; Nicephorus Gregoras, *ibid.*, 604 b; N. Terzaghi, *ibid.*, p. 192)

καὶ πάλιν ἄλλος ἀναγκαζόμενος ἔφη·

''κλῦθί μευ οὐκ ἐθέλοντος, ἐπεί μ' ἐπέδησας ἀνάγκῃ.''

## 221*

(Eusebius, *P.E.*, V, 8, 6 = Wolff, p. 156; cf. Theodoretus, *ibid.*; I. Philoponus, *De opificio mundi*, IV, 20, [p. 202, 13-14 R.]; Nicephorus Gregoras, *ibid.*; N. Terzaghi, *ibid.*)

καὶ ἔτι σαφέστερον·

''τίπτε μ' ἀεὶ θείοντος ἀπ' αἰθέρος ὧδε χατίζων
θειοδάμοις Ἑκάτην με θεὴν ἐκάλεσσας ἀνάγκαις;''

## 222*

(Eusebius, *P.E.*, V, 8, 5 = Wolff, p. 156; cf. Theodoretus, *ibid.*; Nicephorus Gregoras, *ibid.*, 540 a; N. Terzaghi, *ibid.*, p. 191)

καὶ πάλιν·

''ἦλυθον εἰσαΐουσα τεῆς πολυφράδμονος εὐχῆς,
ἣν θνητῶν φύσις εὗρε θεῶν ὑποθημοσύνῃσι.''

> unutterable Destiny; all those, lord, who are born from your radiance and even from Zeus, himself, by the thread of a mighty Destiny.''

And this is what Timaeus spoke darkly when he granted a kindred star to each soul.

### 219*

For all (the gods) say that they have come by Necessity, not simply so, but in a manner—so to speak—of persuasive Necessity. Earlier, we mentioned those (verses) of Hecate by which she is said to appear:

> ''After daybreak, boundless, full of stars, I left the great, undefiled house of God and descended to life-nourishing earth at your request, and by the persuasion of ineffable words with which a mortal man delights in gladdening the hearts of immortals.''

### 220*

And, again, another (god), being compelled, said:

> ''Listen to me, although I do not wish it, since you have bound me by Necessity.''

### 221*

And still, more clearly, (Hecate says):

> ''Why, from the eternally coursing ether, do you need to invoke me, the goddess Hecate, by constraints which bind the gods?''

### 222*

And, again (Hecate says):

> ''I have come, hearkening to your very eloquent prayer, which the nature of mortals has discovered at the suggestion of the gods.''

## 223*

(Eusebius, *P.E.*, V, 8, 6 = Wolff, pp. 157-158; cf. Nicephorus Gregoras, *ibid.*; N. Terzaghi, *ibid.*, p. 193)

καὶ ἑξῆς·

''τοὺς μὲν ἀπορρήτοις ἐρύων ἴυγξιν ἀπ' αἴθρης
ῥηϊδίως ἀέκοντας ἐπὶ χθόνα τήνδε κατῆγες,
τοὺς δὲ μέσους μεσάτοισιν ἐπεμβεβαῶτας ἀήταις
νόσφι πυρὸς θείοιο πανομφέας ὥσπερ ὀνείρους
εἰσκρίνεις μερόπεσσιν, ἀεικέα δαίμονας ἔρδων.''

## 224*

(Eusebius, *P.E.*, V, 12, 1 = Wolff, pp. 130-131; cf. Nicephorus Gregoras, *ibid.*, 539 b-c; N. Terzaghi, *ibid.*, pp. 189-190)

ὅτι δὲ καὶ τὰ ἀγάλματα αὐτοὶ ὑπέθεντο πῶς χρὴ ποιεῖν καὶ ἐκ ποίας ὕλης, δηλώσει τὰ τῆς Ἑκάτης ἔχοντα τοῦτον τὸν τρόπον·

''ἀλλὰ τέλει ξόανον, κεκαθαρμένον ὥς σε διδάξω·
πηγάνον ἐξ ἀγρίοιο δέμας ποίει, ἠδ' ἐπικόσμει
ζῴοισιν λεπτοῖσι, κατοικιδίοις σκαλαβώταις,
σμύρνης καὶ στύρακος λιβάνοιό τε μίγματα τρίψας
σὺν κείνοις ζῷοισι, καὶ αἰθριάσας ὑπὸ μήνην
αὔξουσαν, τέλει αὐτὸς ἐπευχόμενος τήνδ' εὐχήν.''

## 225*

(Eusebius, *P.E.*, V, 9, 1 = Wolff, p. 162; cf. Theodoretus, *Gr. aff. cur.*, X, 22)

ὅτι δὲ σπεύδουσιν ἀναχωρεῖν οἱ κληθέντες θεοί, δηλώσει τὰ τοιαῦτα, λεγόντων·

''λύετε λοιπὸν ἄνακτα· βροτὸς θεὸν οὐκέτι χωρεῖ.''

## 226*

(p. 9 Kr. = Proclus, *In Tim.*, III, 131, 27-132, 2)

καὶ περὶ τοῦ βασιλέως Ἡλίου καὶ τῶν ἐκεῖ θεῶν τὸν ἐκεῖ Διόνυσον ὑμνοῦντες (sc. οἱ θεολόγοι)

'''Ἠελίοιο πάρεδρος ἐπισκοπέων πόλον ἀγνόν,''

τὸν Διὰ τὸν ἐκεῖ, τὸν Ὄσιριν, τὸν Πᾶνα τὸν ἡλιακόν, τοὺς ἄλλους, ὧν αἱ βίβλοι πλήρεις εἰσὶ τῶν θεολόγων καὶ τῶν θεουργῶν.

## 223*

And next (Hecate says):

> "Drawing them down from the ether by unspeakable spells, you brought them easily to this earth against their will. But (the demons) in the middle—the ones who stand on the mid-most gales far from the divine fire—you treat (these) demons shamefully and send them to mortals as prophetic dreams."

## 224*

That even (the gods) themselves have advised how their statues ought to be made and from what kind of material, will be clear from the statements of Hecate to this effect:

> "But execute my statue, purifying it as I shall instruct you. Make a form from wild rue and decorate it with small animals, such as lizards which live about the house. Rub a mixture of myrrh, gum, and frankincense with these animals, and out in the clear air under the waxing moon, complete this (statue) yourself while offering the following prayer."

## 225*

That the gods who are summoned hasten to withdraw, will be clear by statements such as these, where they (sc. the gods) say:

> "Finally, loosen the lord. The mortal no longer makes room for the god."

## 226*

And concerning the King, Helios, and the gods in that place, (the theologians) praise that Dionysos as

> "associate of Helios, gazing upon the holy, celestial pole."

They praise that Zeus, Osiris, the solar Pan, (and) the other (gods) which fill the books of the theologians and the theurgists.

# COMMENTARY

## Fr. 1

**2. τὸν θεουργόν**: Perhaps an allusion to Julian the Theurgist (see Lewy, Exc. IV, p. 463); cf. Saffrey, "Les Néoplatoniciens et les Oracles Chaldaïques," pp. 218-219, who suggests that Julian the Theugist was the "medium" through whom Julian the Chaldean extracted oracles from Plato's "soul."

**3. τι νοητόν**: A reference to the Highest God of the Chaldean hierarchy. (Cf., e.g., frr. 20 *bis*; 21. See, also, the discussion in Lewy, pp. 165-169; 366-375; Festugière, *Rév.*, IV, pp. 132-135.) Although this First God is generally described in Stoicizing terms as a primal, fiery Intellect (e.g., frr. 3, 5, 6), his nature is also regarded as essentially unknowable (e.g., frr. 3, 18, 84, 191). For Proclus, however, this term is not equated with the Plotinian One (who, of course, without qualification, is beyond Intellect), but with the "Father" of his first intelligible triad. (See Lewy, Exc. VII, p. 483.) Cremer, p. 13, equates this term with μόνοι οἱ θεοί of Iambl., *De myst.*, VI.7. See discussion in Introduction.

**νοεῖν**: The repeated use of νοεῖν in this fragment and elsewhere (e.g., frr. 11, 18, 19, 40, 49) to designate the mental apprehension of the Highest God and/or the intelligible world suggests a genuine contemplative aspect to the Chaldean *anagōgē* independent of any external ritual action. A process of contemplative perception is also an important aspect of both Gnostic and Hermetic patterns of ascent. On these matters, see detailed discussion in Introduction.

**νόου ἄνθει**: The "flower of mind" is that discreet, fiery organ or faculty (the highest power of the soul and akin to the fiery essence of the First God) which permits apprehension and/or union with the Highest God. The principle "like by like," a commonplace of Hellenistic philosophy, is apparent here. And so Proclus, *Exc. chald.*, IV; p. 194, 9-10 Pitra: τῷ γὰρ ὁμοίῳ πανταχοῦ τὸ ὅμοιον συνάπτεσθαι πέφυκε. But for Proclus, it is not the "flower of mind" which achieves union with the Highest God, but the "flower of the whole soul" (ἄνθος πάσης τῆς ψυχῆς). Proclus' proliferation of hypostases and triads necessitated such a development, as he identified the Chaldean "Father" not with the Plotinian One, but with the highest level of his first intelligible triad. (See *supra.*) Thus, for Proclus, the ἄνθος νόου could only achieve union with this level, with the ἄνθος πάσης τῆς ψυχῆς effecting union with the One. See *Exc. chald.*, IV; p. 194, 27 ff. Pitra; cf. Rist, "Mysticism," p. 215 ff. See, also, the comments of Smith, *Porphyry's Place*, p. 121, n. 20: "Although Proclus' profusion of stages between human nous and the One is in many ways unsatisfactory, nevertheless the idea of the "flower of the whole soul" looks like a determined effort to call a halt to the infinite regress (or rather progress). This stage differs from the others in being not a further refinement involving an even loftier part of man, but in attempting to reintegrate man as a whole." For Cremer, p. 13, the expression ἄνθος νόου is equivalent to the καθαρὸς λόγος of Iambl., *De myst.*, VI.7. Cf., also, νόου ἄνθος, fr. 49; πυρὸς ἄνθος, frr. 34, 35, 37, 42; Synesius, *H.* 1(3), 140: ἄνθεα φωτός. Plotinus, *Enn.* V.5.8.22-23, speaks analogously of "that element in nous which is not nous" (τῷ ἑαυτοῦ μὴ νῷ; cf. V.3.14.5; VI.7.35.19-24) but is akin to the One.

**4. ἐπεγκλίνῃς σὸν νοῦν**: In Proclus' paraphrase (*Exc. chald.*, IV; p. 194, 20-12 Pitra): τοῦτ' ἔστιν, ἐπερείσῃς ταῖς νοεραῖς ἐπιβολαῖς εἰς τὴν πρὸς ἐκεῖνο συναφήν.

**5. ὥς τι νοῶν**: i.e., as perceiving a specific mental object. In Proclus' paraphrase (*Exc. chald.*, IV; p. 194, 22-23 Pitra): τοῦτ' ἔστιν, κατά τι μέτρον εἴδους καὶ γνώσεως ἐπιβλητικῶς. Cf., also, Plotinus, *Enn.* V.5.6.22-23 (re the nature of the One): οὐ γὰρ ἕνι οὐδὲ τὸ 'οἷον' ὅτῳ μηδὲ τὸ 'τι'; V.5.6.7 (re apprehension of the One): τὸ δὲ οὐκ ἔστι λαβεῖν ὡς τόδε.

**ἀλκῆς**: Here, "strength" alludes to the fiery essence or "flower" of the First God. In this sense, cf. the use of ἀλκή in frr. 32, 49, and 82. Elsewhere, ἀλκή alludes to the "flower/flame of mind" or "spark" within the soul which functions as a theurgic "power" which "binds" or unites the soul to God. In this sense, cf. the use of ἀλκή in frr. 117-119. Festugière, however (*Rév.*, IV, p. 133, n. 2; and so Des Places), translates ἀλκή as "glaive" ("sword") to reinforce the combative imagery of ἀλκή in fr. 2. But this translation, in both instances, obscures the real sense of this important Chaldean term. This expression is also used frequently by Synesius in connection with the "strength" of God; e.g., *H.* 1(3), 527, 534, 581, 601; 2(4), 198, 205, 267; 3(5), 55; 9(1), 16, 66. See Geudtner, pp. 50-53.

**6. ἀμφιφαοῦς**: Cf. ἀμφιφάοντα, fr. 158; ἀμφιφαής, fr. 189 (here, descriptive of Hecate); Synesius, *H.* 1(3), 155: ἀμφιφαὲς φῶς. Light, of course, is descriptive of the intelligible world; darkness, of the material world. Cf. ἀμφικνεφῆς, fr. 163.

**δύναμις**: Here, "power" reinforces the notion of "strength" in connection with the First God. In this sense, cf., esp., ἀλκὴν...δυναμένοιο, fr. 32. Elsewhere, "power" principally refers to the feminine element of the Chaldean triad (e.g., frr. 4, 56, 96) but can also allude to the Second Intellect as well (e.g., frr. 3 and 5). This ambiguity reflects the fact that the Highest God is designated as a "triadic Monad" whose "power" is operative at each moment of the triad. A "triple-powered" Monad is also familiar to certain Gnostic sources. See fr. 26 and notes.

**νοεραῖς στράπτουσα τομαῖσιν**: This Chaldean vocabulary of "intellectual division" (initiated properly at the level of the Second Intellect; cf. τέμνεσθαι, fr. 22; τμήσιος, fr. 179; omnia...secta sunt sicut intellectualiter, fr. 9) is found frequently in the writings of the later Neoplatonists. See, e.g., Proclus, *In Tim.*, II, 256, 24-26: καὶ τὰ λόγια δὲ νοεραῖς μὲν στράπτειν τομαῖς δημιουργὸν λέγοντα; Damascius, I, 315, 22: ὁ δὶς ἐπέκεινα (cf. fr. 169 and notes) νοεραῖς στράπτων τομαῖς. See, also, Synesius, *H.* 1(3), 214; 2(4), 120: νοερὰ δὲ τομά. (Cf. *H.* 1(3), 208, 254-255; 5(2), 24.) These "divisions," of course, are the Chaldean equivalent of the Platonic Ideas. (Cf. ἰδέας....ἐμερίσθησαν, fr. 37.) However, unlike the later Neoplatonists, the Chaldeans apparently did not distinguish clearly between noetic and noeric orders, but used τὸ νοητόν and τὸ νοερόν interchangeably to designate the intelligible world as a whole. Cf., e.g., the use of νοερός in fr. 37. See Festugière, *Rév.*, III, p. 56, n. 3; Theiler, 1942, p. 8 = 1966, p. 261; Hadot, *Porphyre*, I, p. 99.

**7. οὐ δὴ χρὴ σφοδρότητι νοεῖν κτλ.**: In other words, the intelligible reality of the Highest God cannot be perceived in any direct or aggressive manner (such as focusing on a specific mental object), but must be approached obliquely in a state of passive readiness. Cf. Damascius' interpretation, I, 155, 2-3: ὅτι οὐχ ἡ σφοδρὰ (sc. γνῶσις) καὶ ἀντερείδουσα πρός τι γνωστόν,...ἀλλ' ἡ ἀφιεῖσα ἑαυτὴν ἐκείνῳ. Cf., also, Iambl., *Comm. In Parm.*, Fr. 2a (Dillon) re perception of the Intelligible: οὔτε ἐπιβολῇ ὅλως, οὔτε κατὰ ἐπέρεισιν ὡρισμένην οὔτε κατὰ περίληψιν οὔτε τινὰ τοιοῦτον τρόπον ἐκεῖνο γνωστόν. Iamblichus, surprisingly, also states here

that the Intelligible (*contra* our fr. 1) cannot even be known by the "flower of mind" (οὔτε τῷ ἄνθει τοῦ νοῦ αἱρετόν). But, as Dillon notes, (p. 390), the contradiction here is "more apparent than real" in that Iamblichus—in this instance—is commenting on a passage from Plato's *Parmenides* (see, also, Dillon, Fr. 2b and notes *ad loc.*)—and not exegeting the *Oracles*. (Cf., also, Proclus' paraphrase to line 4 = v. 2, *supra*.) Cremer, however (p. 13), prefers to interpret this language as descriptive of the theurgist's "passivity" in preparation for the theurgic *ergon*. See discussion in Introduction.

**8.** ἀλλά: Dam.; οὐδέ, cj. Kroll and Festugière (following Thilo). But οὐδέ here, as Lewy notes (p. 166, n. 373), negates the sense of the entire fragment.

ταναοῦ/ταναῇ: Lewy (pp. 168-169, and so Des Places) translates this term as "subtle," but Hadot (Lewy$^2$, p. 709, n. 36) is surely correct in arguing that this expression properly conveys the sense of "extension," as reflected in the use of τεῖναι, *infra*, l. 11 (= v. 9). Cf., similarly, ἐκτείνας πύριον νοῦν, fr. 128; sed anime noema in unum ampliare, fr. 9a. Cf. also, fr. 12, where ταναή describes the "extension" of the Monad into duality. For Synesius, ταναή is descriptive of matter: *H.* 1(3), 40: ταναᾶς ὕλας. My translation of the entire expression νόου ταναοῦ ταναῇ φλογί is based on Festugière, *Rév.*, IV, p. 133: "tendant à l'êxtreme la flamme de l'intellect." Cf., also, Chaignet, *Damascius*, I, p. 245, and n. 1: "la flamme infinie d'une raison infinie." For Chaignet, ταναή conveys the sense of "extension without limit."

**8-9.** πάντα μετρούσῃ πλὴν τὸ νοητὸν ἐκεῖνο: The point here is that the Highest God cannot be "measured" in any sense since he is without limit and absolute simplicity. (In this regard, cf. the description of the "Once Transcendent" in fr. 152.) The act of "measuring" (like "division") begins at the level of the Second Intellect. Cf. μετροῦσα, fr. 23; μετρεῖται, fr. 31.

**10-11.** ἀγνὸν ὄμμα ψυχῆς: The "eye of the soul" is a common expression for the "spiritual eye" in man and can be equated with the "flower/flame of mind." Cf. ὄμματα πάντα, fr. 112; ψυχῆς ὄμμα φέριστον, fr. 213.

**11.** τεῖναι κενεὸν νόον: The "empty mind" is that which is free of all forms of normal cognition (i.e., it no longer "measures" or focuses "intently" on its object), but is in a state of passive awareness, ready to apprehend or intuit the unified simplicity of the Highest God. Cf. *supra*, l. 5. Cf. also, Numenius' expression ἔρημον/ἐρημία, fr. 2 (Des Places), as the place where the Good is found.

**12.** ἐπεὶ νόου ἔξω ὑπάρχει: In other words, since the intelligible reality of the First God is beyond any form of human thought, it can only be grasped indirectly by that organ or faculty (i.e., "flower/flame of mind," "eye of the soul") to which it is akin. This statement does not contradict fr. 20: τὸ νοητὸν οὐ νοῦ χωρὶς ὑπάρχει (as Dodds thought; see *Proclus: El. Th.*, p. 287) since fr. 20 is describing an ontological situation *vis-à-vis* the Second Intellect, whereas v. 10 of fr. 1 is concerned with human cognition (and so Kroll, p. 12; Lewy, p. 165; Hadot, *Porphyre*, I, p. 325, n. 1). Cf., also, fr. 84: αὐτὸς πᾶς ἔξω ὑπάρχει. But here, the one who "exists outside" is the Highest God, who is essentially beyond all categorization. For the later Neoplatonists, the noun ὕπαρξις (Victorinus: *existentia*) became a regular designation for the Chaldean Father. See, e.g., Rist, "Mysticism," pp. 217-225.

## Fr. 2

**1. φωτὸς κελάδοντος**: This expression apparently alludes to the "rushing sound" of the revolving, celestial spheres. (Cf. *ibid.*, fr. 111; Lewy, pp. 192-193 and n. 59.) In Lewy's interpretation (p. 194), the raiments formed from the substance of the spheres make up the "defensive armor" (or "vehicle") of the soul (cf. fr. 61 and notes) and serve as a form of protection when the soul makes its ascent (depicted in this fragment as a type of "magical assault").

**2. ἄλκῃ τριγλώχινι**: An allusion to the triadic nature of the First God. Cf. Damascius, I, 254, and II, 62, 29 (where God is praised as τριγλῶχις); Synesius, *H.* 9(1), 66: τρικόρυμβον ἄλκαν (as descriptive of the Monad). Cf., also, τριοῦχον, fr. 26 and notes.

**3. πᾶν τριᾶδος**: cj. Ruelle and Kroll; παντοιάδος, codd.; and so Lewy, p. 195, n. 74, who translates this neologism as "Manifold Universe." Cf., also, Des Places, "Notes," p. 321.

**σύνθημα**: This technical term (cf. fr. 109; σύμβολα, fr. 108) is equated by Lewy (p. 195) with the *voces mysticae* or hidden, divine names of the gods. (As such, this term is also equated with the Iynges; cf. frr. 76 and 77.) Here, the τριάδος σύνθημα or "token of the triad" can be equated with the "triple-barbed strength" of v. 2 (as the *vox mystica* of the Highest God) and thus be understood as a theurgic power which functions as a "focusing" device to prod the soul upward. In addition, Lewy suggests that the συνθήματα, in general, functioned as the "magical" means of controlling demonic powers during the ascent. In this regard, cf. Synesius, *H.* 1(3), 539, 620, where the "seal" (σφραγίς) of the Father (equated in vv. 538 and 628 with the term σύνθημα) is said to ward off demonic attacks. But with Synesius, additional Christian imagery is also likely, as the term σφραγίς is used in both orthodox and Gnostic Christian sources to designate baptism, both in its usual lustral sense and, in the Gnostic sources, designating, as well, a "spiritual" baptism or "sealing" of the soul as it ascends. As such, Gnostic "sealing" is also a means of controlling demonic/archontic powers. Cf., e.g., *1 Jeu*, chs. 44-52; *Pist. Soph.*, esp. ch. 138; *Marsanes*, NHC X, 2,12-14; 66*,1-5; *Trim. Prot.*, NHC XIII, 49,27-32.

**4. ἐμπυρίοις ὀχετοῖς**: These "empyrean channels" are the mystical rays of the sun on which the soul makes its ascent. Cf. frr. 65, 66, 110; Synesius, *H.* 1(3), 306; 2(4), 203; 4(6), 36. See Geudtner, pp. 53-56.

**5. περὶ αὐτῆς**: In Damascius' interpretation, this fragment refers to the acquisition of "intelligible knowledge" in the manner set forth in fr. 1. In this regard, cf. Proclus, *In Parm.* VII (ed. C. Steel, p. 512, 86-88 = Kl.-Lab., p. 58, 22-24), where Proclus describes the *via negativa* approach to the One as a type of combat: "...que ab abnegationibus est via ad ipsum plane et ille (sc. Socrates) determinavit, dicens 'ut in pugna' oportere omnia ab ipso auferre et ab omnibus illud separare" (*Rep.* 534 c 1).

**ὁ χρησμῳδῶν θεός**: Probably Apollo; see Lewy, p. 6.

## Fr. 3

**1. ὁ πατήρ**: A frequent designation for the Highest God (*passim*). The later Neoplatonists, however, had problems with this term, sometimes understanding it in the Chaldean sense (e.g., Porphyry, *De regressu an.*, p. 32*,24 Bidez), other times equating it with the highest member of the first intelligible triad (e.g., Pro-

clus; see notes to fr. 1). See, also, the discussion in Rist, "Mysticism and Transcendence," p. 218 ff.

**ἥρπασσεν**: This expression (Lewy translates it "rapt away;" see p. 78 and n. 45; cf. Hadot, *Porphyre*, II, p. 91 and n. 1: "Le père s'est dérobé lui-même") underscores the ontological separation of the Father, who exists apart from everything (cf. fr. 84). This radical transcendence approaches a *via negativa*, as the Father, ultimately, is beyond characterization (cf. frr. 18 and 191). In the context of Psellus, this expression indicates that the Father is ἀκατάληπτον and ἀπερίληπτον. Cf., also, Proclus, *Exc. chald.*, IV; p. 194, 29-31 Pitra: Εἰ γὰρ ὁ πρῶτος πατὴρ ἁρπάζειν ἑαυτὸν λέγεται τοῦ νοῦ καὶ τῆς δυνάμεως, τίς ὁ μηδὲ οὕτως ἁρπᾶσαι δεηθεὶς ἑαυτὸν, ἀλλ' ὑπερηρπασμένος ἀπὸ πάντων ἁπλῶς, καὶ θεὸς πάντων ὑμνούμενος;

Plotinus also uses this expression, but in connection with the contemplative ascent to Nous; e.g., *Enn.* V.3.4.11: συναρπάσαντα ἑαυτὸν εἰς τὸ ἄνω. An analogous term is χωρίζειν, which is common not only to the later Neoplatonists (as well as Plotinus), but to Gnostic sources as well (in both an ontological and anagogic sense). Cf., e.g., *Marsanes*, NHC X, 9,9 and 22, where the term ἀναχωρεῖν expresses, respectively, the ontological "withdrawal" of the Aeon Barbelo (apparently from two of the "powers" of the "Three-Powered One") as well as the "withdrawal" of the Gnostic into his self. Similarly, in 9,29-10,2, the "invisible Spirit" is said to "run up" (**ⲡⲱⲧ ⲁϩⲣⲏⲓ**) to his "place" (τόπος), expressing this same idea of divine withdrawal or contraction. However, in the last analysis, it is only Plotinus who achieves a thorough-going transcendence with his doctrine of the One. See, in this regard, Dodds, "Parmenides," pp. 129-142; Dillon, *Middle Platonists*, pp. 386-389.

A last analogy is found in Paul's *Epistle to the Philippians*: οὐχ ἁρπαγμὸν ἡγήσατο τὸ εἶναι ἴσα (*Phil.* 2:6). L. Abramowski would interpret this New Testament usage of ἁρπαγμόν as a similar expression of transcendence; see *Drei christologische Untersuchungen*, pp. 1-17.

**2. δυνάμει νοερᾷ**: An allusion to the Second or Demiurgic Intellect, who is directly responsible for shaping the cosmos according to the Ideas. Cf. frr. 5 and 7; Festugière, *Rév.*, IV, p. 132.

**ἴδιον πῦρ**: i.e., the fiery essence of the Father which remains separate and distinct from the Second Intellect. Cf. ἴδιον, fr. 82; Synesius, *H.* 8(9), 54: ἰδίου πυρὸς ἀρχάν (but here, with reference to Christ).

## Fr. 4

**3. ἡ μὲν γὰρ δύναμις κτλ.**: On the basis of this oracle, the later Neoplatonists discerned a Chaldean triad of Father ( = ἐκείνῳ; ἐκείνου), Power, and Intellect. Porphyry, apparently, was the first to make this distinction; cf., e.g., *De regressu an.*, pp. 36*,15-19; 37*,7-10 Bidez; Hadot, *Porphyre,* II, p. 91 and n. 2. This triad was also understood by the later Neoplatonists in terms of ὕπαρξις, δύναμις/ζωή, νοῦς. However, as Tardieu points out ("Oracles chaldaïques," pp. 214-215), triads of this type antedate Porphyry, since similar triads appear in the Gnostic sources known to Plotinus and his school. Cf., in this regard, the triads ὕπαρξις, **ⲱⲛϩ** = ζωή, νοῦς (*Steles Seth,* NHC VII, 125,28-32); **ⲡⲏ ⲉⲧⲉ ⲡⲁⲓ̈ ⲡⲉ** = ὕπαρξις or τὸ ὄν; **ⲱⲛϩ** = ζωή; **ⲧⲙ̄ⲛⲧⲉⲓⲙⲉ** = νοήσις (*Allogenes,* NHC XI, 49,28-38). See Robinson, "Three Steles of Seth," pp. 132-142. Pearson (*Nag Hammadi Codices IX and X*, pp. 246 and 275) suggests that the triad

γνῶσις, ὑπόστασις, ἐνέργεια in *Marsanes,* X, 9,16-18 belongs to this group as well. In terms of the Chaldean triad, Proclus (cf. *Th. pl.,* 365, 3ff.) and Damascius (cf. I, 87, 1-4 = fr 27; 108, 17-19) placed it beneath the One at the level of the first intelligible triad. (See Hadot, *Porphyre,* I, pp. 260-272; Rist, "Mysticism and Transcendence," p. 218 ff.) In any event, the triadic understanding of this oracle (combined with the monadic-triadic language of frr. 26 and 27) resulted in an understanding of the Chaldean First God as a three-in-one deity, a notion congenial to both Synesius and Victorinus, who grafted the Chaldean triad (as mediated through Porphyry) onto the Christian Trinity. The result: a median, feminine hypostasis equated with the Christian Spirit. See further discussion in Introduction.

In addition, this fragment also suggests the possibility of a primordial, bisexual deity; i.e., a Father who exists alongside of or "with" (σύν) his Power. (See Kroll, p. 28; Lewy, pp. 82; 340-343.) The Second Intellect would then be generated from this androgynous god (ἀπ' ἐκείνου). A bisexual First God is also mentioned in *C.H.* I.9 (ἀρρενόθηλυς); *Asclepius,* 20 (Deus...utraque sexus fecunditate plenissimus), and in several Gnostic sources (e.g., *Gos. Eg.,* NHC III, 42,10-11: ⲡϩⲟⲟⲩⲧ ⲥϩⲓⲙⲉ ⲛ̄ⲉⲓⲱⲧ). Cf., also, Synesius, *H.* 5(2), 63-64: σὺ πατήρ, σὺ δ' ἐσσι μάτηρ/σὺ μὲν ἄρρην, σὺ δὲ θῆλυς. But the immediate source of Synesius' imagery is probably Porphyry; cf., *De philos. ex or. haur.,* Wolff, p. 146: δ' ἐσσὶ πατὴρ καὶ μητέρος (see Lewy, p. 24, n. 59). Theiler, 1942, pp. 6-7 = 1966, p. 259 cites a similar passage from Macrobius, *In Somn.,* I, 6, 7 ff.: "unum autem, quod μονάς id est unitas dicitur, et mas et femina est..." Theiler, *ibid.,* suggests that this passage from Macrobius probably derived from Porphyry's lost commentary on the *Timaeus,* but would ultimately reflect a Chaldean origin. Thus the notion of a bisexual Supreme God as a Chaldean tenet is fairly secure (despite Dodds' objection that such a notion is not "explicitly attested for the Oracles"; see "New Light," p. 266, n. 9 = Lewy$^2$, p. 695, n. 9).

## Fr. 5

**2. πῦρ ἐπέκεινα τὸ πρῶτον**: As a "Transcendent Fire," the Chaldean First God, although appropriating Stoic imagery, nevertheless remains removed from the lower orders of being and participates only indirectly in the process of creation. Cf., esp., ἴδιον πῦρ, fr. 3; ἄπαξ ἐπέκεινα, fr. 169.

**ἐὴν δύναμιν κατακλείει**: Here, "power" again alludes to the Second Intellect. Cf. ἐῇ δυνάμει νοερᾷ κλείσας, fr. 3.

**3. νοῦ νόος**: i.e., the Second Intellect. Epithets of this type are common. Cf., esp., πηγὴ πηγῶν, fr. 30 and notes. Cf., also, χρόνου χρόνος, fr. 185.

**3-4. ὁ κόσμου τεχνίτης πυρίου**: The Second Intellect as Demiurge initially fashions the intelligible or Empyrean World of Ideas. Cf. ἐργοτεχνίτης/τεχνίτης, fr. 33; ποιητής, fr. 68 (here, it is the sensible world which is formed).

## Fr. 6

**3. ὑπεζωκώς**: In the context of Simplicius, this expression is descriptive of Atlas. However, in a Chaldean context, the reference would be to Hecate as the "girdling" World Soul. In this regard, cf. ὑπεζωκὸς πυρὸς ἄνθος, fr. 35 and notes. Although Lewy (pp. 353-354 and n. 159; cf. p. 92 and n. 101) feels this "girdling" notion is dependent on Plato, *Tim.,* 36 e, Dodds ("New Light," p. 270,

n. 24 = Lewy$^2$, p. 699, n. 24) contests this dependence as "over-ingenious." Lewy (p. 93) also notes that statues of Hecate often included a girdle (ζωστήρ) wrapped about her hips, which the Neoplatonists interpreted in cosmic terms; e.g., Damascius, I, 242, 14 ff. Proclus (*In rem p.*, II, 225, 1-5; cf. Lewy, p. 92, n. 102; Exc. VII, p. 484) situates ὁ ὑπεζωκώς—as a noetic entity—at the lowest point of the intellectual order, and thus on the border of the intelligible and sensible worlds (in the manner of the World Soul). Tardieu ("Oracles chaldaïques," p. 208, following Kroll, *loc. cit.*, n. 1) equates ὑπεζωκώς with the Valentinian Horos, who performs a similar "girdling" function between the intelligible and sensible orders.

**ὑμήν**: Damascius, II, 13, 29 (who quotes our line in full); codd.: οὐ μήν and ἡμῖν. Heiberg did not isolate this line as a Chaldean verse, but kept it as part of Simplicius' text. Thus, for Heiberg, the line referred to Atlas as ὑπεζωκώς τις, οὐ μὴν νοερός. Bidez, however (*RPh*, 1903, pp. 79-81), was the first to separate this line from Simplicius' text (following Damascius), thus constructing our two-verse oracle. Kroll evidently overlooked Simplicius altogether, citing only Damascius' text (and so Lewy). But then Festugière, in apparent ignorance of Bidez's research, "discovered" these two lines once more ("Un Vers méconnu des Oracles chaldaïques dans Simplicius," *Symb. Os.*, XXVI, 1948, pp. 75-77), but neither Bidez nor Festugière was able to connect the role of ὑπεζωκώς with the Chaldean Hecate.

**5. πῦρ πρῶτον καὶ πῦρ ἕτερον κτλ.**: Festugière (*ibid.*, p. 77) understands this line as referring to the first and second "feux-intellects" who are separated by the median ὑπεζωκὼς. However, if ὑπεζωκώς is understood as a World Soul figure, then the two fires of this line refer, respectively, to the noetic "fire" (or sun) of the intelligible world and its material counterpart, the mundane sun. Cf., in this regard, ἄλλο πυρήοχον, fr. 65 and notes; πυρὸς ὄγκος...ἕτερος, fr. 68 and notes. See, also, Kroll, p. 35; Bidez, *ibid.*, p. 81. But either interpretation is possible, assuming a pervasive, median principle (Hecate/δύναμις/ὑπεζωκώς) operating at various levels of reality.

**σπεύδοντα**: Cf. frr. 115, 116, 134.

**μιγῆναι**: Cf. μιγνυμένων, fr. 66 (in an anagogic context).

## Fr. 7

**1. ἐξετέλεσσε**: The "activity" of the Father consists of "perfectly" thinking the world as an intelligible model. Cf. οὐ...ἀτελές, fr. 13.

**1-2. νῷ παρέδωκε δευτέρῳ, ὃν κτλ.**: Cf. Numenius, fr. 17 (Des Places): Ὦ ἄνθρωποι, ὃν τοπάζετε ὑμεῖς νοῦν οὐκ ἔστι πρῶτος, ἀλλ' ἕτερος πρὸ τούτου νοῦς πρεσβύτερος καὶ θειότερος. The problem of influence here is much discussed. Dodds ("Numenius," p. 11, *contra* Festugière, "Religion grecque," p. 482; cf. Waszink, "Porphyrios," pp. 43-45) argues (rightly, I think; cf. Tardieu, "Oracles chaldaïques," p. 234) for a Chaldean origin: "...the address to mankind is both natural and usual in oracles, whereas in a philosophical dialogue it is anything but usual and has in fact the air of being dragged in by Numenius." But cf. Lewy (pp. 320-321 and notes 26-29), who argues for a third source, suggesting that both Numenius and the *Oracles* mutually borrowed a "paraenetic motif" from Platonists of "similar tendency." (Cf. Dillon, *Middle Platonists*, p. 364 who, similarly, would not rule out a third source.) Lewy also points out that the "profound differences" between the *Oracles* and Numenius

(e.g., Numenius' dualism with its evil world soul in contrast to the monistic, "Father-generated" universe of the Chaldean system; the developed doctrine of Chaldean emanations which is missing in Numenius) further argue against direct borrowing. This may be true for both systems as a whole, but should not then preclude a process of selective borrowing in terms of certain congenial ideas. Thus, it may well be that Numenius has borrowed this particular verse (assuming his eclectic philosophical interests) as supportive of his "two Intellects" doctrine.

## Fr. 8

**2. δυάς**: An allusion to the dyadic nature of the Second Intellect, who functions both as a contemplative and active (or demiurgic) Mind; i.e., he both contemplates the intelligible world as well as directs his activity towards the sensible world. Cf. δύο, fr. 12; δὶς ἐπέκεινα, fr. 169 and notes. Cf., also, Numenius, fr. 15 (Des Places): ὁ μὲν οὖν πρῶτος περὶ τὰ νοητά, ὁ δὲ δεύτερος περὶ τὰ νοητὰ καὶ αἰσθητά. (See Lewy, pp. 114-115 and n. 187; Festugière, *Rév.*, III, pp. 55-56; Des Places, pp. 125-126.)

**τῷδε**: Most likely the Father or First Intellect (and so Festugière, *Rév.*, III, p. 55; Des Places, p. 121). But cf. Lewy (p. 114, n. 187), who suggests the Second Intellect and translates v. 1 as "duality is attached to him," viz. the Second Intellect (and so Hadot, *Porphyre*, I, p. 201, n. 1). Cf., also, Dillon ("The Concept of Two Intellects," pp. 177-179), who argues that fr. 8, as a whole, should be regarded as a continuation of fr. 7 (which Lewy had already suggested; see p. 112, n. 181) and, thus, would understand τῷδε here as referring to the νῷ δευτέρῳ of fr. 7. This "Dyad" of fr. 8, then (as a Second Intellect), would be third in rank after the Father and a First Intellect distinct from the Father. Thus, for Dillon, this doctrine of "two Intellects" (situated after the Father) would differ from that of Numenius, for whom the First Intellect remains supreme. But such a schematization of the Chaldean hierarchy (in terms of any well-defined doctrine) cannot be affirmed on the basis of the fragments. The most that can be said is that the *Oracles*, perhaps, were moving in this direction, but essentially remained fluid in doctrine.

It should also be noted that Dillon's argument, in part, is based on the comments of *Anon. Taur.* IX, 1-5, where there is mention of the Father's δύναμις, νοῦς, and ἄλλον πάλιν <ν>οῦν. But as Dillon states, this doctrine may well be a Porphyrian innovation (or even criticism) of Chaldean teaching, especially assuming Porphyry's purported authorship of this "anonymous" document. In this regard, see Hadot, *Porphyre*, I, pp. 102-143; II, pp. 61-113.

**4. τὰ νοητά**: i.e., the Ideas. Cf. frr. 31, 40, 108.

**5. αἴσθησιν**: Cf. αἰσθητοῖς, fr. 40; αἰσθητά, fr. 41.

**κόσμοις**: A probable allusion to the stars. Cf. κόσμων, fr. 34. See Kroll, p. 28; Festugière, *Rév.*, III, p. 55, n. 5.

## Fr. 9

Fragments 9 and 9a have been isolated as Chaldean by Saffrey (*loc. cit.*), but Saffrey does not attempt to reconstruct the Greek. Earlier, Theiler had reconstructed part of our fr. 9a ( = fr. 9, Des Places), but his reconstruction is problematic (see *infra.*) Following Saffrey, then, no attempt has been made here

to reconstruct either the Greek or meter of these lines. However, the fragments have been separated from Proclus' text by quotes to maintain the uniformity of our text.

**2. le unum:** Moerbeke has introduced the French article here rather than use a Latin demonstrative pronoun; see discussion in Steel, V. I, pp. 44*-45*.

**5. omnia enim ex uno entia:** Cf. fr. 10: εἰσὶν πάντα ἑνὸς πυρὸς ἐκγεγαῶτα. If the Latin here is an accurate reflection of the Greek text (and not a re-wording of either Proclus or his Latin redactor), then the *Oracles* apparently referred to the Highest God as One in addition to his other designations. But cf. notes to fr. 10.

**5-6. omnia...secta sunt sicut intellectualiter:** Saffrey (p. 233, n. 51) compares the expression νοεραῖς τομαῖσιν in fr. 1. Cf., also, ἐμερίσθησαν νοερῷ πυρὶ μοιρηθεῖσαι εἰς ἄλλας νοεράς, fr. 37, with regard to the "division" of the Ideas/Intelligibles.

**6. in corpora multa:** Cf., again, fr. 37, where (in a slightly different sense) the Ideas/Intelligibles are said to "break" (= "divide") themselves on the "bodies" of the worlds (ῥηγνύμεναι κόσμου περὶ σώμασιν).

## Fr. 9a

**3. neque in tuo intellectu detinere:** Theiler (p. 94, Klibansky-Labowsky) reconstructs the Greek as: ...μηδ' ἐν σῷ νῷ καταΐσχειν (= fr. 9, Des Places; cf. νῷ μὲν κατέχειν τὰ νοητά, fr. 8). But Tardieu (Lewy$^2$, p. 679) finds Theiler's restoration problematic, suggesting (as Saffrey has done) that the entire Latin text should be cited here instead.

**multivarium aliud:** Saffrey (p. 222) cites as a parallel πολυποικίλου ὕλης, fr. 34 and, thus, would reconstruct the Greek here as: πολυποίκιλον ἄλλο.

**4. anime noema in unum ampliare:** Cf. fr. 1, v. 6: νόου ταναοῦ ταναῇ φλογί; v. 9: τεῖναι κενεὸν νόον εἰς τὸ νοητὸν. Thus, this Latin fragment reinforces our contention that the Chaldean *anagōgē* consisted, in part, of a genuine contemplative (or *via negativa*) approach to the Highest God. But whether fragments such as these should be labelled "philosophical" (as opposed to "theurgical"), as Saffrey suggests (p. 219), is problematic. See further discussion in Introduction.

## Fr. 10

**1. ἑνὸς πυρός:** Whether the Chaldeans ever designated the Highest God simply as "One" is problematic. According to *Anon. Taur.* IX,1 (see Kroll, p. 12), the answer is no: ὡς καὶ τὸ ἓν λέγειν αὐτὸν εἶναι παντελῶς παραιτεῖσθαι. (See Hadot, *Porphyre*, II, p. 64 ff., who argues that Porphyry is the author of this "anonymous" work.) But cf. Psellus, *P.G.* 122, 1149 c 5-6: μίαν ἀρχὴν τῶν πάντων δοξάζουσι, καὶ ἓν αὐτὴν καὶ ἀγαθὸν ἀνυμνοῦσιν; *Hypotyp.* 1: ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀῤῥήτου...ἑνός. (Psellus' interpretations are, perhaps, based on a Proclan exegesis of our fragment. See Lewy, p. 81, n. 54. Cf., also, fr. 9: omnia enim ex uno entia.) Hadot, *ibid.*, p. 93, n. 3, suggests that the ambiguity here may simply reflect a tension between "the affirmation and negation of the notion of the One." This tension is certainly borne out in those fragments where the Highest God is affirmed as Father, Monad, Intellect, etc., but then negated as essentially unknowable (e.g., frr. 3, 18, 84); but his affirmation simply as One remains inconclusive.

## Fr. 11

**1. ἐν τοῖς νοητοῖς καὶ κρυφίοις θεοῖς**: Cf. Proclus, *El. Th.*, prop. 162: πᾶν τὸ καταλάμπον τὸ ὄντως ὂν πλῆθος ἑνάδων κρύφιον καὶ νοητὸν ἐστι. (See O'Neill, *Proclus: Alc. I*, p. 32, n. 102.)

**τριττῶν...ὑποστάσεων οὐσῶν**: In addition to the "Good," Proclus mentions "Wisdom" (τὸ σοφόν) and "Beauty" (τὸ καλόν).

**3. τἀγαθόν**: If Westerink's reconstruction of this line is correct, then the *Oracles* characterized the Highest God as Good as well, perhaps, as One; see *supra*, frr. 9 and 10. But cf. Kroll, *loc. cit.*, who cites only the final hemistich as oracular; and so Lewy, p. 80, n. 52. Cf. Proclus, *In Eucl., loc. cit.*, for the same attestation.

νοοῦσα: cj. Westerink; νοούσης, codd.

πατρικὴ μονάς: Although Monad, the Father is also implicitly a triad. Cf., e.g., μουνάδα/τριοῦχον, fr. 26; τριάς/μονάς, fr. 27.

## Fr. 12

**1. (ἡ ὁλότης)**: In the context of Damascius, "wholeness" is equated with Aion or "Eternity." Cf., in this regard, (τὸ) ὅλον φῶς, fr. 59. For Proclus, however (*loc. cit.*), this term is understood in a Pythagorean context and thus equated with "the line" (ἡ γραμμή).

**3. ταναὴ (γὰρ) μονάς ἐστιν ἢ δύο γεννᾷ**: Damascius equates this notion of "extensibility" or "tension" (τετάσθαι, l. 1) into "duality" with Aion; for Proclus, the context is again Pythagorean, and thus descriptive of the "point" (as monad) extended into the "line" (as dyad). In a Chaldean context, however, δύο would properly refer to the Second Intellect. Cf. δυάς, fr. 8; cf., also, ταναοῦ/ταναῇ, fr. 1 and notes.

**4. μένειν ἀεὶ τῇ ἀόκνῳ στροφάλιγγι**: Cf. αἰεί τε μένειν ἀόκνῳ στροφάλιγγι, fr. 49 (with reference to Aion). Because Damascius quotes part of this oracular fragment here (in addition to his equation of "wholeness" with Aion), Lewy (p. 99 and notes 137-138) suggests combining these two fragments in the following manner: Αἰὼν πατρογενὲς φάος <ὡς> ταναὴ μονάς ἐστι, ἢ δύο γεννᾷ· <καὶ or ἤ> πολύ, etc. For Lewy, then, fr. 12 means that Aion is a "subtle monad" with a "dual aspect;" viz. he is "sustained" by the "strength" of the Father while transmitting motion or "light" to the Ideas (or "Sources" and "Principles;" see fr. 49). This interpretation is a trifle over-ingenious. It is simpler to see fr. 12 as simply alluding to the "extension" of the Father or First Intellect (as μονάς; cf. πατρικὴ μονάς , fr. 11) into the demiurgic Second Intellect (or "Dyad;" see *supra*).

## Fr. 13

**1. πατρικῆς ἀρχῆς**: Another designation for the Highest God, who is the Source or Principle of all that exists. Cf. Synesius, *H.* 1(3), 172; 2(4), 62: ἀρχῶν ἀρχά. Cf., also, frr. 40 and 49, where the ἀρχαί are the Ideas contained in the Paternal Principle. See, also, Lewy, pp. 115-116 and n. 192.

**οὐ...ἀτελές**: Cf. ἐξετέλεσσε, fr. 7. Psellus, *loc. cit.*, connects this Chaldean notion of Paternal perfection with *Jas.* 1:17: πᾶν δώρημα τέλειον ἄνωθέν ἐστι καταβαῖνον ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς τῶν φώτων.

τροχάζει: Cf. τροχάουσαν, fr. 56.

## Fr. 14

**1. πατὴρ οὐ φόβον κτλ.**: The meaning of this verse is obscure. Lewy (p. 147, n. 295) thinks Psellus, *loc. cit.*, incorrectly inserted πατήρ here and suggests that the beginning of the line might have read instead: οὐ <μὲν γὰρ> φόβον, etc. In Lewy's analysis, the verse is directed against the current magical belief that an invoked god inspired terror or fear.

**ἐνθρῴσκει**: Compounds of θορεῖν are common in the *Oracles*; cf. frr. 34, 35, 37, 42, 76, 87. See, also, Theiler, 1942, p. 15 = 1966, p. 269.

**πειθώ**: Cf. πειθηνίδι, fr. 81 (as descriptive of the Father's "will"). See Cremer, p. 17.

## Fr. 15

**3. πᾶς ἀγαθὸς θεός**: Proclus here is commenting on Plato, *Rep.* II, 379 b-c to the effect that God is essentially good. According to Proclus, Plato's remarks must be expanded to include the notion that "every god is good," a view he then substantiates by quoting this verse from the *Oracles*. This Chaldean verse, however, is probably distinguishing between "good" or "true" gods who are helpful to mankind, and those spirits or demons who are evil and deceitful (particularly in the context of various theurgic rites). Cf. frr. 88-93 and notes; Iambl., *De myst.*, III.31; Lewy, pp. 273-275 and n. 55.

**4. νήψατε**: This notion of "sobering up" is also found in the Hermetica (e.g., *C.H.* I.27; VII.1; 2) and Gnostic sources (e.g., *Gos. Truth*, NHC I, 22,16-20). The general idea here is that those who are "intoxicated" by the world and its passions need to "sober up" and reflect on the true nature of reality. But cf. fr. 97, where the soul is said to be "drunk" on god, a metaphor often expanded to the idea of "sober drunkenness." In this regard, cf. Lewy, *Sobria ebrietas*, *passim*, who especially cites numerous references in the writings of Philo. Cf., also, Jonas, *Gnostic Religion*, pp. 68-73. Des Places would also now translate this expression as "sober up" ("degrissez-vous") rather than "abstain" ("jeûnez"); see "Notes," p. 322.

## Fr. 16

**1. τὸν ὑπερουράνιον τόπον**: i.e., the intelligible world. Cf. Iambl., *De myst.*, VIII.7: ὑπερουρανίων θεῶν; fr. 18: ὑπέρκοσμον; frr. 19 and 209: ὑπερκοσμίοις.

**2. θεοθρέμμονι**: Lewy (p. 160, n. 355) cites Plato, *Phaedrus*, 247 d as the *locus classicus* of this term: θεοῦ διάνοια νῷ...τρεφομένη. Cf. τροφή, fr. 17.

**σιγῇ**: "Silence" characterizes the supermundane "depth" or "abyss" where the Father dwells. Cf. Synesius, *H.* 1(3), 82; 2(4), 83, 85; 5(2), 22, 65; 8(9), 61; 9(1), 75. Cf., also, σῖγα, fr. 132; Des Places, *testimonia*, p. 70, for additional parallels. In the Gnostic sources, σιγή often designates the female syzygy of the Highest God (who, in turn, is often called Abyss). See, e.g., Iren., *Adv. Haer.*, 1.1; 2.1; *Val. Exp.*, NHC XI, 22, 26. Des Places now suggests that fr. 16, in its usage of σιγή, is "closer" to a Gnostic milieu than he had previously thought; see "Notes," p. 323.

**3. τῶν πατέρων**: A reference either to the Father and Second Intellect (cf. frr. 22, 50 and notes) or to the rulers of the three worlds of Chaldean cosmology (cf. fr. 73 and notes). See, also, Lewy, p. 160 and n. 353; Theiler, 1942, pp. 9-12 = 1966, pp. 262-263.

## Fr. 17

1. τῷ δὲ νοοῦντι: In the context of Proclus, a reference to the perceptive capacity of the gods and certain "wise men" ( = the theurgists? Cf. Festugière, *Tim.*, I, p. 46, n. 3). See, also, Lewy, pp. 160-161 and n. 355, who suggests that the gods in question are the νοεροὶ θεοί (based on Proclus, *In Crat.*, 92, 12-14).

τροφή: Cf. θεοθρέμμονι, fr. 16.

## Fr. 18

1. τὸν ὑπέρκοσμον πατρικὸν βυθόν: "Paternal Abyss" characterizes the noetic or "supermundane" home of the Father. Cf., e.g., Synesius, *H.* 1(3), 132: ἀκάμαντι βυθῷ; 189: βυθὸν ἄρρητον; 5(2), 27: βυθὸς πατρῷος; 9(1), 116: βυθὸν...θεολαμπῆ; 1(3), 411: βάθος αἰώνων. See, also, Lewy, p. 159, n. 35; Des Places, *testimonia*, p. 70, for additional parallels. In fr. 163, however, the terms βυθός/βάθος also designate the Material World. A similar equation is found in Plotinus as well, where both the One and matter are characterized in terms of absolute simplicity (e.g., *Enn.* VI.7.13.3-4). See Tardieu, "Oracles chaldaïques," pp. 205-209, who also cites Gnostic parallels to what he calls this "apophatic characteristic of high and low." Des Places now affirms that Chaldean usage of βυθός is closer to Gnostic usage than he had previously thought; see "Notes," p. 323.

νοοῦντες: Again, knowledge of the Highest God is a matter of intelligible perception (cf. e.g., frr. 17 and 19).

2. πρὸς αὐτούς: For Proclus, the "intellectual gods" (cf. notes to fr. 17). In Lewy's analysis (pp. 159-161), the Chaldeans did not distinguish between intellectual and intelligible gods (as did the later Neoplatonists), but asserted only the existence of planetary gods situated beneath Aion. However, these planetary gods, in Lewy's words, were "endowed with intellectual knowledge of the intelligible world" and thus were conceived of as "noetic entities."

ὁ ὕμνος: Cf. τὸν Παῖανα ἀείδειν, fr. 131.

## Fr. 19

2. τόνδε...θεόν: A reference to the Paternal Intellect; see Lewy, p. 160, n. 354.

πᾶς νοῦς: i.e., "every *divine* mind" has the ability to perceive the Paternal Intellect; cf. fr. 18. From frr. 17-19, it can be inferred that ascent to the intellectual gods (or the Chaldean equivalent) imbued the soul with a similar noetic disposition, in preparation for the final "leading upward" towards the Father himself (as described in fr. 1).

## Fr. 20

1-2. οὐ γὰρ ἄνευ νόος κτλ.: (Des Places' text mistakenly reads νοός.) This fragment suggests that the intelligible world of Ideas exists within the mind of the Second Intellect (νόος) and not outside. (Cf. fr. 8: νῷ μὲν κατέχειν τὰ νοητά.) Such a notion is consistent with second-century speculation about the ontological location of the Platonic forms. See Lewy, pp. 167 and n. 379; 322-324; Festugière, *Rév.*, III, p. 56, n. 3; Hadot, *Porphyre*, I, p. 325, n. 1.

## Fr. 20 *bis*

This fragment is neither cited by Kroll nor designated as oracular by Chaignet, but Lewy suggests the possibility; see p. 167, n. 379.

**1-2.** (ὁ πατήρ) νοητόν: Cf. τι νοητόν, fr. 1.

**2.** τὸ νοοῦν: The primary function of the Father is to "think" the intelligible world of Ideas. However, it is the Second Intellect who actively fashions the intelligible world on the model of these Ideas. Cf., esp., fr. 37.

## Fr. 21

**1.** νοητῶς: Again, the reference is to the Father or First Intellect who is the intelligible source of all that exists. See Lewy, pp. 81 and n. 55; 333 and n. 75. Cf. Marius Victorinus, *Adv. Ar.* I, 50, 20: "universaliter omnimodis omnia." Hadot (*Marius Victorinus*, II, p. 852, *ad not.*) sees a reflection here of this particular fragment.

## Fr. 22

**3.** νοῦς πατρός: Here, the Second or Demiurgic Intellect; cf. frr. 5 and 7. Festugière (*Rév.*, III, p. 55) compares frr. 5, 7, and 22 with Numenius, fr. 12 (Des Places): τὸν μὲν πρῶτον θεὸν εἶναι ἔργων συμπάντων. Thus, the First God or Father remains removed from his creative "acts," which are the province of the Second Intellect.

εἶπε: The notion of speech as a creative "act" is more common in Oriental than Greek traditions. The best known example, of course, is the Biblical account of creation in *Gen.* 1. Note that Proclus, *In Tim.*, *loc. cit.*, l. 23, equates εἰπεῖν with νοεῖν.

εἰς τρία...τέμνεσθαι: This initial division would involve just the intelligible world. Cf. νοεραῖς τομαῖσιν, fr. 1; τμήσιος, fr. 179. Cf., also, ἐμερίσθησαν/μεμερισμέναι, fr. 37.

**4.** <πρωτίστου πατρός>: Des Places has added πρωτίστου to Kroll's emendation of πατρός. (Cf. πρωτίστου πατρός, fr. 179, intro.) The reference here is to the Father or First Intellect.

**5.** οὗ: codd.; οὐ, cj. Des Places (following Bidez); ᾧ, cj. Festugière (*Rév.*, III, p. 55 and n. 3).

τὸ θέλειν κατένευσε: This expression reflects *Il.* 1, 524-530; 8, 175, where Zeus "nods" to indicate his "will." (See Lewy, p. 106, n. 165.) In the Chaldean system, "will" is a constituent of both the Father and the human soul. Cf. forms of βουλή in frr. 37, 77, 81, 107. Cf., also, νεύματι, fr. 44; Cremer, p. 102 ff. In the Gnostic and Hermetic literature, "will" is also an active, even hypostatized, aspect of God. Cf., e.g., Iren., *Adv. Haer.*, 1, 29, 1; *Gos. Truth*, NHC I, 37,18-34; *C.H.* I.8; 31; VII.5.

ἤδη: The idea of simultaneous thought and action is also reflected in fr. 25. Cf., also, *C.H.* I.14; X.2; XIII.19; *Asclepius*, 8; *Ap. John*, NHC II, 7,4-9.

## Fr. 23

**1.** (οἱ στίχοι χρησμοῦ): Didymus cites this verse as one of several oracles from different sources.

**2.** τὰ πάντα: Although forms of πᾶς are frequent in the *Oracles*, here (and in frr. 30, 53, 68) the substantive is best translated as "the All," a *terminus technicus*

familiar to us from various Gnostic sources. (The Coptic form would be ⲡⲧⲏⲣϥ̄.) In the Gnostic sources this term designates, as here, a general notion of universality as well as, more specifically, the hypostatized Aeons which, collectively, comprise the Gnostic pleroma. (See Logan, "The Meaning of the Term 'the All,'" pp. 203-208, who, in addition, includes the totality of the Gnostic "elect".)

**τριάς**: Here, the activity of the Second Intellect (understood triadically) whose "measures" are the Ideas. (See Hadot, *Porphyre*, I, p. 261 and n. 2, who points out that the Ideas were also understood triadically in the Chaldean system.) It is the function of the Second Intellect to delimit or measure the All by actively projecting the Ideas onto the intelligible world. See Lewy, p. 108, n. 173; cf. p. 116. Lewy cites as a parallel a similar "oracle" quoted by Hermias, *Phaedr.*, 248 a; p. 157 Couvreur: τριὰς κατὰ πάντα μετροῦσα. Couvreur mistakenly identified this verse as Orphic; and so Kern, *Orph. Fr.* 310.

**συνέχῃ**: An allusion to the "connective" nature of this triad. Cf. frr. 24 and 30; δέμα, fr. 31.

**κατά...μετροῦσα**: tmesis; cf. πάντα μετρούσῃ, fr. 1; τὰ νοητὰ μετρεῖται, fr. 31.

## Fr. 24

**1. ἡ μέση δυάς**: In the context of Damascius, a reference to the median intelligible-and-intellectual order made up of the Connectors, Teletarchs, and Iynges. See Lewy, Exc. VII, pp. 483-484.

**συνοχική**: Cf. frr. 32, 80, 82, 177, 207.

**τελεταρχική**: Cf. frr. 86 and 177.

**1 + 3. διορίζουσα...ἀρχήν...τέρμα...μέσα**: The formula is Pythagorean. Cf., e.g., Arist., *De caelo*, A 1 268 a 10: καθάπερ γάρ φασι καὶ Πυθαγόρειοι τὸ πᾶν καὶ τὰ πάντα τοῖς τρισὶν ὥρισται· τελευτὴ γὰρ καὶ μέσον καὶ ἀρχὴ τὸν ἀριθμὸν ἔχει τὸν τοῦ παντός, ταῦτα δὲ τὸν τῆς τριάδος (as cited by Lewy, p. 109 and n. 174). Cf. also, *Orph. Fr.* 21 (Kern) re Zeus: ὁ μὲν δὴ θεός...ἀρχήν τε καὶ τελευτὴν καὶ μέσα τῶν ὄντων ἁπάντων ἔχων ( = Plato, *Laws*, IV, 715 e).

**3. τάξει ἀνάγκης**: τάξει is equivalent to σειρά (cf. fr. 203) and refers to one of the "orders" or "chains" which link all aspects of the cosmos. Cf. Proclus, *In Parm.*, 904, 12-18, which is a reflection of this fragment: ὁ δὲ εἷς πατρικὸς νοῦς πᾶσιν ἀφορίζει τὰ μέτρα τῆς μεθέξεως...ἀρχάς τε καὶ μέσα καὶ τέλη τῆς ἑκάστου τῶν εἰδῶν σειρᾶς προλαβών, καὶ μέχρι πόσου φθάνειν ἀνάγκη τὴν ἰδιότητα τὴν ἀφ' ἑκάστου καθήκουσαν.

## Fr. 25

**2. ἐνόησε**: Analogous to εἶπε, fr. 22. Again, the idea here is one of simultaneous thought and action. See Lewy, pp. 180-181 and n. 19.

**βροτὸς δέ οἱ ἐψύχωτο**: The Father, then, is the ultimate source of particular souls. Cf. fr. 115; Psellus, *Hypotyp.* 24. Elsewhere (frr. 51 and 53), "ensouling" is associated with the World Soul.

## Fr. 26

Lewy, p. 106, n. 164, thinks this isolated verse from a hymn of Proclus (see Vogt, *Hymni*, fr. II, p. 84) is a Proclan "imitation" of the verse cited *infra*, fr. 27; and so Tardieu, Lewy$^2$, p. 680. But Hadot, *Porphyre*, I, p. 96, n. 2, accepts

its authenticity, as does Des Places. Although Proclus is clearly dependent on Chaldean terminology throughout his hymns, this would be the only instance of an entire verse cited verbatim. In addition, Lydus states only that the verse is Proclan, not Chaldean, in origin. As the verse stands, then, although inspired by the *Oracles*, it is most likely the finished creation of Proclus.

**1. τὸν ἅπαξ ἐπέκεινα**: Another designation for the Father; see fr. 169 and notes.

**2. μουνάδα**: Cf. μονάς, frr. 11, 12, 27.

**τριοῦχον**: Cf. Damascius, I, 303, 23-25: καὶ εἰ προφήνειεν ἐν ἑαυτῷ τὸ τριαδικὸν ἡνωμένον, πολλῷ μειζόνως τὸ ἓν μείνειεν τριοῦχον κτλ. Cf. also τριγλώχινι, fr. 2 and notes. In the Gnostic sources, the expression **ⲡⲁ ⲧⲱⲁⲙⲧⲉ ⲛ̄ⲟ̄ⲁⲙ** (and variants; see, e.g., *Marsanes*, NHC X, 6,19; 4,15-16; *Allogenes*, NHC XI, 45,13; *BG* 27,19-28,2) conveys the same idea. The Greek equivalent would be τριδύναμος (or τριδύναμις), a term which appears not only in the Gnostic sources but in Marius Victorinus as well (e.g. *Adv. Ar.* IV.21). Note that Hadot, *op. cit.* (cf. pp. 293-294 and n. 2), translates τριοῦχον as "triple-powered," based on Victorinus's use of τριδύναμος. See, also, Theiler, 1942, p. 12 = 1966, p. 265. In the Gnostic sources, however, the expression "triple-powered" is by no means used exclusively of the Highest God. See Pearson, *Nag Hammadi Codices IX and X*, pp. 266-268, *ad not.*; cf. pp. 245-246, for a rich discussion of this material.

## Fr. 27

**1. πατήρ-δύναμις-νοῦς**: See fr. 4 and notes.

**1-2. ὁ εἷς πατὴρ ὁ πρὸ τῆς τριάδος**: i.e., the Father in his monadic aspect.

**3. παντὶ γὰρ ἐν κόσμῳ**: Damascius, II, 87, 11-15, understands here the three worlds of Chaldean cosmology. For Proclus, *Th. pl.*, 271, 14-15, it is a matter of ἐν ἑκάστῳ διακόσμῳ (of the intelligible-and-intellectual world).

**τριάς, ἧς μονὰς ἄρχει**: Thus, the oracle establishes a monadic-triadic principle which informs every aspect of reality. See Lewy, pp. 106-107 and n. 164.

## Fr. 28

**1. τὰ νοητά**: i.e., the Ideas. Cf. *ibid.*, frr. 8, 31, 40, 108.

**3. τῆσδε γὰρ ἐκ τριάδος**: An allusion to the triadic nature of the Highest God; cf. *ibid.*, fr. 29. See, also, Lewy (pp. 116-117 and n. 195), who points out that the later Neoplatonists understood this and related verses as suggestive of a divine Ennead consisting of a) the Paternal Monad with his Power and Intellect; b) a triad of "primordial" Ideas; c) a triad of "particular" Ideas. Although Lydus attributes this Ennead to the Chaldeans themselves (e.g., *De mens.*, IV, 122; p. 159, 5-7 W.: θεῖος ὁ ἐννεάδος ἀριθμὸς ἐκ τριῶν τριάδων πληρούμενος καὶ τὰς ἀκρότητας τῆς θεολογίας κατὰ τὴν Χαλδαϊκὴν φιλοσοφίαν...ἀποσώζων; cf. Damascius, I, 299, 17: ἡ ὑμνουμένη ἐννεάς), an explicit Ennead cannot be attributed, with certainty, to the *Oracles*. The innovator here is undoubtedly Porphyry. See Hadot, *Porphyre*, I, p. 262 and n. 1.

**κόλποις**: A frequent expression in the *Oracles*. Here, it designates the feminine (and thereby fecundating) power in which the Father "sows the All" (cf. μήτρα, fr. 30). Elsewhere, this term is especially associated with the fecundating power of the World Soul (e.g., frr. 32, 35, 37, 56, 96). For Synesius, κόλπος not only expresses the Father's generation of the Son (*H.* 1(3), 406; 4(6), 7), but his

generation of "light," "mind," "soul" (*H.* 3(5), 29-30), as well as life *in toto* (*H.* 2(4), 195-207). A similar diversity of use is found in the Gnostic sources: e.g., *Gos. Truth*, NHC I, 24,10-11 (here, the Father's "bosom/womb" is "revealed" as the Holy Spirit); *Ap. John*, NHC II, 5,5 (here, Barbelo is referred to as the "womb of all things"); *Gos. Eg.*, NHC III, 43,1 (here, the Father, Mother, and Son = "three ogdoads or powers" who issue from the Father's "bosom/womb"). In the last analysis, what is being expressed in all these sources is the notion of a bisexual or androgynous deity as the primogenitor of various aspects of creation.

ἔσπαρται: Cf. ἔσπειρεν, fr. 108; ἐνέσπειρεν, fr. 39 and notes.

## Fr. 29

This verse continues the thought of fr. 28. Lewy, however (p. 179, n. 8), suggests (without explanation) that this verse may be a continuation of fr. 44. But this view is puzzling, in light of Lewy's interpretation of νεύματι in fr. 44 (for which, see notes *ad loc.*).

2. τῆσδε γὰρ ἐκ τριάδος: Cf. *ibid.*, fr. 28.

πνεῦμα: Here, a likely allusion to the "Breath" contained in the World Soul. (In this regard, cf. πνεῦμα, fr. 35 and notes.) Des Places, however, (p. 128, following Theiler, 1942, p. 28 = 1966, p. 286), suggests an allusion to the ὄχημα-πνεῦμα or "vehicle" of the soul. But this is unlikely, as the soul's vehicle is acquired in its descent to earth (see fr. 61) and not fashioned by the Father in any direct sense.

ἐκέρασσεν: A reflection of the "mixing bowl" metaphor in Plato, *Tim.*, 35 a. Cf. κεράσσῃ, fr. 42; κράσας, fr. 44.

## Fr. 30

2. πηγὴ τῶν πηγῶν: In the context of Damascius, a reference to the Highest God (αὐτοζῷον) as the ultimate origin or "Source" of all existence. Cf. Synesius, *H.* 1(3), 171; 2(4), 63: παγὰ παγῶν. Synesius continues his praise of God with a string of similar epithets: e.g., ἀρχῶν ἀρχά; ῥιζῶν ῥίζα; μονὰς μονάδων; ἀριθμῶν ἀριθμός; πάτερ πατέρων. Epithets of this type are common; see, e.g., Des Places, p. 128, for additional parallels. Lewy, however (p. 82 and n. 59), understands the Chaldean verse as referring specifically to the Father's δύναμις (and so Hadot, *Porphyre*, I, p. 310 and n. 6). In this regard, cf. fr. 56, where it is Rhea, as World Soul, who is designated πηγή.

4. μήτρα: Again, a likely allusion to the Highest God as a bisexual deity. Cf. notes to δύναμις, fr. 4; κολποῖς, fr. 28.

συνέχουσα: This verb conveys the double sense of "contain" and "connect;" cf. συνέχῃ, fr. 23.

τὰ πάντα: Cf. *ibid.*, frr. 23, 53, 68.

## Fr. 31

1. τάξις: Cf. frr. 24, 110 and notes.

2. ἀμφοῖν: i.e., the Paternal Monad (cf., e.g., frr. 11 and 39) and Dyad ( = Second Intellect; cf. frr. 8 and 12). Damascius equates the Monad and Dyad with the first and second intelligible triads of Proclus' system. See, e.g., Proclus,

*Th. pl.*, III, 26; 91, 4-6, S.-W.; Lewy, pp. 107-108 and n. 170; Hadot, *Porphyre*, I, p. 261 and n. 2.

**2-3. τριάδος...πρώτης οὔσης οὐ πρώτης**: An allusion to the "measurable" triad of the Second Intellect. Cf. frr. 23, 24 and notes. The "truly" first triad is that of the Paternal Monad in its trinitarian aspect (cf. fr. 26), which cannot be measured in any way.

**2. δέμα**: A reference to the connective quality of the "measurable" triad. Cf. συνέχῃ, fr. 23 and notes.

**3. τὰ νοητά**: The Ideas; cf. *ibid.*, frr. 8 and 108.

**μετρεῖται**: Cf. μετρούσῃ, fr. 1; μετροῦσα, fr. 23.

## Fr. 32

**1. αὐτοζῷον**: An equivalent term for πατρικὸς νοῦς. See Lewy, p. 83, n. 62; Festugière, *Tim.*, II, p. 297 and n. 1. Cf. αὐτογένεθλος, fr. 39.

**2. πυρὸς ζωηφόρου**: This term describes the principle of life contained in the Paternal Intellect. Cf. ζωηφόριον πῦρ, fr. 65 and notes.

**3. ζῳογόνον**: A regular epithet of Rhea-Hecate. Cf. ζῳογόνῳ, fr. 54, intro.; ζῳογόνου, fr. 56, intro. As a noetic entity, Proclus locates ἡ ζῳογόνος θεά at the second level of the intellectual order. See Lewy, Exc. VII, p. 484.

**κόλπον**: Cf. frr. 35, 37, 56, 96, where "womb" is similarly associated with the World Soul.

**4. ἐπιρρεῖ**: codd. Lewy, however (p. 83, n. 62), emends to προχέει based on a similar usage in fr. 56.

**τοῖς συνοχεῦσιν**: The "Connectors" are a class of noetic entities (= active Thoughts or Ideas of the Father) whose primary function is to conjoin the various parts of the Universe. Cf. frr. 80, 82, 177, 207; Lewy, pp. 129-132. The Connectors form a triad along with the Teletarchs (cf. frr. 86, 177) and Iynges (cf. frr. 76, 77). In Proclus' system, the συνοχεῖς are situated at the second level of the intelligible-and-intellectual order. See Lewy, Exc. VII, p. 483; cf. Psellus, *Hypotyp.* 4.

**5. ἀλκήν...πυρὸς μέγα δυναμένοιο**: Common to the *Oracles* as expressive of the Father's fiery essence. Cf. ἀλκῆς δύναμις, fr. 1, and the use of ἀλκή in frr. 49 and 82.

**ζειδώροιο**: Cf. Synesius, *H.* 1(3), 304; 3(5), 27.

## Fr. 33

**2 + 4. ἐργοτεχνίτης/τεχνίτης**: These terms describe the demiurgic nature of the Second Intellect. Cf. τεχνίτης, fr. 5; ποιητής, fr. 68; Lewy, p. 113 and n. 185.

**4. κόσμου...πυρίου**: The Empyrean (= intelligible) World. In Chaldean cosmology there are three worlds: the Empyrean (or intelligible); Ethereal (or zone of the fixed stars and planets); Material (or sublunar world including earth). Cf., e.g., Proclus, *In Tim.*, II, 57,9-12: τί οὖν; φαίη τις ἂν τῶν ἐκ τῆς ὑπερορίου θεοσοφίας (= Chaldean theology) ὡρμημένων καὶ τὰ πάντα διαιρουμένων εἰς ἐμπύριον αἰθέριον ὑλαῖον. Psellus, *P.G.*, 122, 1149 c, further distinguishes three Ethereal and three Material Worlds (cf. fr. 57 and notes). Lewy (pp. 137-157; 376-377; 430-431) attempts to sort out the confusion here. See, also, discussion in Introduction.

## Fr. 34

3. **ἔνθεν**: i.e., πηγὴν πηγῶν. Cf. πηγὴ τῶν πηγῶν, fr. 30.

**γένεσις...ὕλης**: Cf. esp. Psellus, *Hypotyp.* 27: ἡ μὲν ὕλη πατρογενής ἐστι. This monistic understanding of creation contrasts, in particular, with the dualistic tendencies of Numenius and certain strains of Gnostic thought. See discussion in Introduction.

**πολυποικίλου ὕλης**: Lewy (p. 118 and n. 200; cf. pp. 111, n. 177, v. 10; 120, n. 204) equates this expression with κοσμοῦ σώματα in fr. 37 as a description of the "world-stuff" composed of the four elements. Cf. Proclus, *In Tim.*, I, 388, 21: ἔνθεν ἄδην θρῴσκει γένεσις πολυποικίλου ὕλης. (See Festugière, *Tim.*, II, p. 254, n. 1.) Tardieu ("Oracles chaldaïques," p. 281) cites, analogously, *Exc. Theod.* 50,1: τῆς πολυμεροῦς καὶ ποικίλης ὕλης. See, also, fr. 9: multivarium aliud.

4. **συρόμενος**: Cf. συρομένην, fr. 63; σύρων, fr. 164; κατασύρων, fr. 70. Cf., also, Synesius, *H.* 8(9), 64: σύρων; 1(3), 307: κατασυρομέναις.

**πρηστήρ**: An allusion to the noetic Ideas which are projected from the Paternal Intellect like bolts of lightning. Cf. πρηστῆρσιν, frr. 81 and 82; πρηστηροδόχοι and κεραυνοί, fr. 35; Synesius, *H.* 1(3), 161: πρηστηροκράτωρ. The imagery undoubtedly goes back to the vision of Zeus hurling his thunderbolts. See Lewy, pp. 118-119 and n. 200.

**πυρὸς ἄνθος**: Here, an oblique reference to Hecate as the "girdling flower of fire" (see fr. 35; cf. frr. 37 and 49), the cosmic equivalent of the νόου ἄνθος (fr. 1). See, also, Lewy, p. 92, n. 100.

5. **κόσμων ἐνθρῴσκων κοιλώμασι**: The "hollows of the worlds" are the planetary spheres whose corporeal element "obscures" or "dims" (ἀμυδροῖ) the "flower of fire." See Lewy, pp. 118, n. 200; 126 and n. 228. Cf. κόσμοις ἐνθρῴσκουσαι, fr. 76; κόσμοις ἐνθρῴσκον, fr. 87.

6. **τὸ κάτω**: An allusion to the world of matter. Cf. frr. 163-164.

**ἀκτῖνας ἀγητάς**: i.e., the "rays" of the sun which originate in the noetic fire of the Father. Tardieu ("Oracles chaldaïques," p. 202) equates this term with the "spark of soul" (cf. fr. 44) which is akin to the noetic fire. Cf., similarly, ἀκτίς, *Treat. Res.*, NHC I, 43,31; *Paraph. Shem*, NHC VII, 4,5-6. Cf., also, αὐγῆς, fr. 35; αὐγάς, fr. 115.

## Fr. 35

1. **ὁ ἅπαξ ἐπέκεινα**: Cf. fr. 169 and notes.

**τὴν ἑβδομάδα**: For Proclus, the νοερὰ τάξις consisting of 1) ὁ ἅπαξ ἐπέκεινα; 2) Ἑκάτη; 3) ὁ δὶς ἐπέκεινα; 4-6) οἱ τρεῖς ἀμείλικτοι; 7) ὁ ὑπεζωκώς. See Lewy, Exc. VII, p. 484.

2. **κατὰ μέθεξιν**: This doctrine of "participation" is Platonic in origin; e.g., *Parm.* 132 d: ἡ μέθεξις τοῖς ἄλλοις...τῶν εἰδῶν.

3. **τοῦδε**: i.e., ὁ ἅπαξ ἐπέκεινα.

**ἐκθρῴσκουσιν**: Cf. ἐξέθορον, fr. 37; ἔκθορε, fr. 42.

**ἀμείλικτοι κεραυνοί**: A vivid image of the noetic Ideas proceeding from the Father (or "Once Transcendent"). Cf., analogously, πρηστήρ, fr. 34; πρηστῆρσιν, frr. 81 and 82. Cf., also, ἀμειλίκτου πυρός, fr. 36. In Lewy's words: "The attribute ἀμείλικτος signifies that the Ideas are characterized as ἀμείλικτοι δεσμοί (Hesiod, *Theog.* 658) which 'bind matter in forms.'" (See p. 119, n. 201; cf. p. 121, n. 209.) As noetic entities, Psellus (*Hypotyp.* 10) locates the "Implacables" just above the cosmic triad of Faith, Truth, Love (cf. fr. 46). In Pro-

clus' system, the ἀμείλικτοι are equated with the ἄχραντοι θεοί and situated at the next to lowest point of the intellectual order.

**4. πρηστηροδόχοι κόλποι**: A reference to Hecate (= World Soul) as the receptacle of the Ideas.

**παμφεγγέος**: Des Places' text mistakenly reads παραφεγγέος (but now corrected; see "Notes," p. 324). Light/fire are characteristic of the intelligible/Empyrean World. Cf. forms of φέγγος/φέγγειν in frr. 39, 122, 125, 219. See, also, Synesius, *H.* 1(3), 532: νοερὸν φέγγος. Cf. *H.* 2(4), 163; 3(5), 43; 5(2), *passim*; 9(1), 100.

**αὐγῆς**: Cf. αὐγάς, frr. 115 and 213.

**5. πατρογενοῦς Ἑκάτης**: Cf. πατρογενὲς φαός (= Aion), fr. 49; ἡ ὕλη πατρογενής, Psellus, *Hypotyp.* 27. In the last analysis, the Father is the source of all reality, be it Empyrean, Ethereal, or Material. As for Hecate, she not only functions as World Soul in the Chaldean system (e.g., frr. 6, 51-53, 56), as well as δύναμις between the First and Second Intellects (e.g., fr. 4), but is invoked as an oracle-giving goddess (frr. 146-148; cf. frr. 219; 221-224) and is said to be Mistress of demons (fr. 91).

**ὑπεζωκὸς πυρὸς ἄνθος**: Epithet of Hecate as the "girdling" World Soul. Cf. ὑπεζωκώς, fr. 6 and notes.

**6. πνεῦμα**: Here, the "breath of life" which fills up the World Soul. According to Lewy (p. 122), "wombs," "girdling fire," and "breath" are all aspects of the World Soul which combine with the Ideas (as "thunderbolts") to perfect the sensible world. Cf. Chaignet, *Proclus: Comm. Parm.*, I, p. 180, n. 6, who sees an allusion here to the πνεῦμα ἄπειρον of the Pythagoreans.

**πόλων πυρίων**: For Lewy, *ibid.*, the four cardinal points situated in the region of the fixed stars; for Chaignet, *ibid.*, "des mondes du feu." Cf. πόλον, fr. 226; Des Places, pp. 129-130.

## Fr. 36

**1. τὴν πρωτίστην πηγήν**: Cf. πρώτη πατρὸς πηγή, fr. 37; <πρωτίστου πατρός>, fr. 22.

**3. νοῦς πατρός**: Here, apparently, the Paternal or First Intellect. Cf. *ibid.*, fr. 37; πατρὸς νοῦ, fr. 134; πατρικὸς νόος, frr. 39, 49, 108, 109.

**ἀρράτοις...ἰθυντῆρσιν**: A probable allusion to the orderly circuits of the stars and planets (Des Places, p. 130). Lewy (pp. 135-136 and n. 260) equates this expression with κόσμων κοιλώμασι in fr. 34.

**ἐποχούμενος**: Cf. ἐποχεῖσθαι, fr. 193. Cf., also, Numenius, fr. 2 (Des Places): ἐποχούμενον ἐπὶ τῇ οὐσίᾳ; Plotinus, *Enn.* I.1.8.9: ἐποχούμενον τῇ νοητῇ φύσει. In the case of Plotinus, Armstrong, *Intelligible Universe*, p. 96, suggests that this term conveys the sense of "transcending, but in contact."

**4. ἄγναμπτον**: Cf. ἀκαμπεῖς, fr. 79.

**στράπτουσιν**: Cf. στράπτουσα, fr. 1; στράπτουσαι, fr. 37.

**ἀμειλίκτου πυρός**: Equivalent to the ἀμείλικτοι κεραυνοί, fr. 35.

## Fr. 37

**2. νοῦς πατρός**: Again, a reference to the Father or First Intellect; cf. *ibid.*; fr. 36 and notes. See, also, Festugière, *Rév.*, III, pp. 55-56.

**ἐρροίζησε**: Cf. ῥοιζοῦνται, *infra*, l. 10 (= v. 9); ῥοῖζον, fr. 107; ῥοιζαῖον, fr. 146; Synesius, *H.* 2(4), 35: ῥοῖζος. Lewy (p. 110 and n. 177) equates this term with ἔβλυσε, *infra*, l. 16 (= v. 15).

**ἀκμάδι βουλῇ**: Cf. βουλαῖς ἀφθέγτοις, fr. 77; πειθηνίδι βουλῇ, fr. 81; ἀϊδίῳ βουλῇ, fr. 107; νεύματι θείῳ, fr. 44; τὸ θέλειν κατένευσε, fr. 22 (and notes). "Will," then, like "Power" and "Intellect," functions as a hypostatized faculty of the Highest God. Cf. Synesius, who often conflates "Will" with the function of "Power" in a Christian context: e.g., *H.* 2(4), 96-98: γόνιμον βουλάν,/μεσάταν ἀρχάν,/ἁγίαν πνοιάν. See Lewy, esp. pp. 79-80 and n. 49; Cremer, p. 102 ff.

**3. παμμόρφους**: Cf. πάμμορφον, fr. 186 *bis*.

**πηγῆς μιᾶς ἄπο**: Cf. μία πηγή, *infra*, l. 9 (= v. 8); πηγῆς πατρικῆς ἄπο, *infra*, l. 14 (= v. 13). This image of the Father or First Intellect as "Source" (cf. πηγὴ τῶν πηγῶν, fr. 30) is also found in both Gnostic and Hermetic literature; e.g., *BG*, 26,17; *C.H.* XI.3

**ἄπο πᾶσαι**: cj. Schneck *ap.* Kroll (and so Lewy and Des Places). This reading is also confirmed by the Latin text of Moerbeke (C. Steel, I, p. 146, 8): a fonte autem uno omnes prodierunt. Morrow-Dillon, however (p. 168), apparently base their translation on Cousin (ἀποπτάσαι): "they (the Ideas) leapt out in flight." But the use of ἄπο here as a postpositive is confirmed by a similar construction in v. 13 (πηγῆς πατρικῆς ἄπο) and fr. 213, v. 1 (χθονίων παθέων ἄπο).

**4. ἐξέθορον**: Cf. ἐκθρῴσκουσιν, fr. 35; ἔκθορε, fr. 42.

**πατρόθεν...βουλή τε τέλος τε**: Again, the image is that of simultaneous thought and action. Cf. frr. 22 and 25; see Lewy, p. 111, n. 177, v. 3. Cf., also, πατρόθεν, frr. 77 and 130.

**5. ἐμερίσθησαν**: "Division" is characteristic of the Ideas. Cf. μεμερισμέναι, *infra*, l. 10 (= v. 9); τομαῖσιν, fr. 1; τέμνεσθαι, fr. 22; τμήσιος, fr. 179.

**νοερῷ πυρί**: Here, apparently the Second Intellect. But cf. πυρὸς νοεροῦ, fr. 81; Festugière, *Rév.*, III, pp. 56, n. 3; 57, n. 1.

**6. ἄλλας νοεράς**: i.e., the "particular" Ideas which inform the sensible world. See Lewy, pp. 105-117.

**7. νοερὸν τύπον ἄφθιτον**: i.e., the "primordial" Ideas (cf. ἀρχεγόνους ἰδέας, *infra*, l. 16 = v. 15) thought by the Paternal Intellect.

**11. ῥηγνύμεναι κόσμου περὶ σώμασιν**: Lewy (pp. 118-119 and n. 201) compares this image with that of the Ideas as ἀμείλικτοι κεραυνοί: "The underlying conception is that these Ideas, by virtue of their noetic fire, exercise upon the primal matter of the world an action similar to that of the smith who melts iron in fire and moulds it with a hammer." See, also, Proclus, *In Tim.*, III, 103, 13, who repeats this line and comments on it as a reference to the "particular" or "demiurgic" Ideas.

**κόλπους**: The "wombs" of the World Soul which receive the Ideas. Cf., esp., fr. 96.

**12. σμήνεσσιν**: The bee simile reflects *Il.* 2,87-90.

**13. στράπτουσαι**: Cf. frr. 1 and 36.

**14. ἔννοιαι νοεραί**: i.e., the Ideas. Cf. ἔννοια πατρός, fr. 38; πατρικὰς διανοίας, fr. 53.

**15. δρεπτόμεναι πυρὸς ἄνθος**: Cf. δρεψάμενος νόου ἄνθος, fr. 49 (here, applied to Aion).

**ἀκοιμήτου χρόνου**: According to Lewy (p. 105, n. 162), Chronos is equivalent to Aion in the Chaldean system. Dodds, however ("New Light," p. 266 = Lewy$^2$, p. 696), disagrees, pointing out that citations of χρόνος in the fragments suggest an independent deity. Cf. ἀπέραντον χρόνου, fr. 39; χρόνου χρόνος, fr. 185; cf., also, Synesius, *H.* 8(9), 63: ἀκαμαντοπόδας χρόνος. Proclus certainly makes this distinction; e.g., *El. Th.*, prop. 53: πάντων τῶν αἰωνίων προϋπάρχει ὁ αἰών, καὶ πάντων τῶν κατὰ χρόνον ὁ χρόνος προϋφέστηκεν. Elsewhere

(*In Tim.*, III, 20, 22-23; cf. fr. 199), Proclus states that οἱ θεουργοί regard Χρόνος as a god. Similarly, in *C.H.* XI.5, Time and Eternity are also distinguished, but in an anagogic context: καὶ πάντα χρόνον ὑπεράρας Αἰών γενοῦ, καὶ νοήσεις τὸν θεόν. This Time/Eternity distinction, of course, ultimately goes back to Plato, *Tim.*, 37 d, where Time is understood as an "image" of Eternity. However, a clear and precise distinction between Chronos and Aion cannot be affirmed with certainty for the Chaldean system. See, also, Dodds' discussion, *Proclus: El. Th.*, pp. 228-229.

**16. ἔβλυσε**: Cf. βλύζει, fr. 51 (here, connected with Hecate).

**17. αὐτοτελής**: Cf. ἐξετέλεσσε, fr. 7; οὐ ἀτελές, fr. 13. Cf., also, αὐτογένεθλος, fr. 39 and Des Places, "Notes," p. 324.

## Fr. 38

**3. ἔννοια πατρός**: The "particular" Ideas of the Second Intellect. Cf. ἔννοια νοεραί, fr. 37; πατρικὰς διανοίας, fr. 53; Psellus, *P.G.*, 122, 1135 a: (οἱ Χαλδαῖοι) ἰδέας νομίζουσι νῦν μὲν τὰς τοῦ πατρὸς ἐννοίας (as cited by Lewy, p. 280, n. 84).

**ἐμόν**: The speaker is Hecate. The verse states that her place in the intelligible hierarchy is after the particular Ideas of the Second Intellect, thus conforming here to the Neoplatonic position of the World Soul. Cf., esp., fr. 53; Lewy, p. 91 and n. 97; Hadot, *Porphyre*, II, p. 71, n. 2.

**εἰλυμένον πῦρ**: A probable allusion to Hecate as the "girdling fire;" cf. ὑπεζωκώς, fr. 6; ὑπεζωκὸς πυρὸς ἄνθος, fr. 35. Lewy (pp. 91-92 and n. 98) translates "winding fire" and points to a serpentine image which draws on a traditional association of Hecate with snakes. Cf., in this regard, fr. 55.

## Fr. 39

**3. ἔργα νοήσας**: i.e., the intelligible "works" or model of the world "thought" by the Father. Cf. πατρὸς ἔργα τὰ νοητά, fr. 40.

**πατρικὸς νόος**: Cf. frr. 49, 108, 109. Elsewhere (e.g., frr. 37 and 134), νοῦς πατρός is used in an analogous sense. See, also, Lewy, p. 79, n. 48.

**αὐτογένεθλος**: Cf. αὐτοζῴον, fr. 32, intro.; αὐτοτελής, fr. 37 (expressions which are similarly descriptive of the Highest God). This notion of "self-generation" is also a common feature of various Gnostic systems, especially the term αὐτογενής. Cf., e.g., *Gos. Eg.*, NHC III/IV *passim*; *Marsanes*, NHC X, 3,26; *Allogenes*, NHC XI, 46,11; 51,26; 58,12; *Pistis Sophia*, I,1; 28. Although there is a general tendency in the Gnostic systems to designate the second principle as "self-generated" and the first principle as "ungenerated" or "unbegotten" (cf., esp., the triad ἀγέννητον, αὐτογενές, γεννητόν of the Peratae as reported by Hipp., *Haer.* 5.12; see, also, *Disc. 8-9*, NHC VI, 57,13-15: ἀγέννητος, αὐτογέννητος, γεννητόν), this is by no means a hard and fast rule. In this regard, cf. Cod. Bruce, *Untitled*, e.g., chs. 1, 7, and 22, where the terms αὐτογενής/αὐτογέννητος designate the Highest God, but in, e.g., chs. 2, 6, and 12, the similar αὐτοπάτωρ is descriptive of a lesser being. Cf., also, Synesius, *H.* 1(3), 145-147 re the Supreme God: πατέρων πάντων/πάτερ αὐτοπάτωρ/προπάτωρ ἀπάτωρ; *Orph. Hymn* 10.10 (ed. Athanassakis) re Φύσις as αὐτοπάτωρ and ἀπάτωρ; Iambl., *De myst.*, VIII.3 re the second principle: αὐτοπάτορος αὐτογόνου. Although this wide diversity of use suggests that this vocabulary of "self-generation" was simply "in the air" during the period of the Empire,

Whittaker ("Self-Generating Principles," pp. 176-189) argues that the principle mode of transmission at this time may well have been via oracular literature (such as the *Chaldean Oracles*). Since this "self-generating" language can be traced back to some of the choral odes of the Greek tragedians (e.g., Sophocles, *OC*, 698; see Whittaker, pp. 185-186), later transmission via the "poetical" mode of oracles (Chaldean and otherwise) is an attractive argument.

**4. ἐνέσπειρεν**: Cf. ἔσπαρται, fr. 28; ἔσπειρεν, fr. 108. Cf., also, Numenius, fr. 13 (Des Places), where the First God is depicted as a "Sower" (ὁ μέν γε ὢν σπέρμα...σπείρει), the Second God as a "Planter." (See Festugière, *Rév.*, III, pp. 44 and n. 2; 57 and n. 1.) This "sowing" imagery is also found *passim* in the hymns of Synesius and, of course, is a common biblical metaphor as well.

**δεσμὸν πυριβριθῆ ἔρωτος**: Like the Connectors (cf. frr. 32, 80, 82, 177, 207), Eros functions as a "binding" force in the Universe whose "fiery" nature derives from the Father or Primordial Fire. Cf. δεσμῷ ἔρωτος and πῦρ συνδέσμιον, fr. 42; ἔρωτα συνδετικόν, fr. 44. Cf., also, *Orig. World*, NHC II, 109,4, where Eros is described as "fire from light." See Tardieu, *Trois Mythes Gnostiques*, pp. 149-150. See, also, Lewy, pp. 126-129 and n. 232; Geudtner, pp. 46-27; Des Places, "Notes," pp. 324-325.

**6. χρόνον ἀπέραντον**: Cf. ἀκοιμήτου χρόνου, fr. 37 and notes.

**7. πατρὸς νοερῷ φέγγει**: Cf. Synesius, *H.* 1(3), 523: νοερὸν φέγγος; Proclus, *In Tim.*, I, 348, 22-23: τῷ νοερῷ φέγγει τοῦ πατρός, ὥς φησι καὶ τὸ λόγιον; *Th. pl.*, I, 24; 106, 13 S.-W.: τοῦ νοεροῦ φέγγους.

**9. κόσμου στοιχεῖα**: An allusion either to the stars (Lewy, p. 127, n. 232; cf. Des Places, pp. 130-131) or the four elements (Proclus, *loc. cit.*).

## Fr. 40

**2. ἀρχάς**: The "world-forming Ideas" of the Second or Demiurgic Intellect. (See Lewy, p. 115 and n. 190; cf. frr. 49 and 74.) The Ideas are called "Principles" because they derive from the Paternal Principle (πατρικῆς ἀρχῆς, fr. 13). Kroll, *loc. cit.*, equates this term with the Young Gods of Plato, *Tim.*, 42 a.

**πατρὸς ἔργα νοήσασαι τὰ νοητά**: i.e., the "primordial" Ideas or intelligible model thought by the Father. Cf. ἔργα νοήσας πατρικὸς νόος, fr. 39.

**3. αἰσθητοῖς ἔργοις καὶ σώμασιν ἀμφεκάλυψαν**: A description of the particular Ideas informing matter. Cf. fr. 68.

## Fr. 41

**4. ταίσθητα νοούσης/ὡς ἐπαφητά**: The Chaldean context of this verse is obscure. Lewy (p. 115, n. 190) sees an allusion to fr. 40. In the context of Proclus, the verse is connected with the mediating activity of the World Soul. (Cf. Festugière, *Tim.*, III, p. 344, n. 1, who finds the entire passage unclear.) Elsewhere, Proclus understands both "knowledge" (γνῶσις) and "contact" (συναφή) as stages in prayer. See *In Tim.*, I, 211, 8 ff.; cf. fr. 121 and notes.

## Fr. 42

**2. δεσμῷ ἔρωτος ἀγητοῦ**: Cf. πῦρ συνδέσμιον, *infra*, l. 3 (= v. 1); δεσμὸν πυριβριθῆ ἔρωτος, fr. 39 and notes.

**ἐκ νόου ἔκθορε πρῶτος**: Eros is the first issue from the Paternal Intellect, even prior to the Ideas, as his binding quality is an essential ingredient if the Ideas

are to function properly in their capacity as connective entities. See Lewy, pp. 127-128 and n. 233.

**3-4. κέρασσῃ πηγαίους κρατῆρας**: A quasi-mythological image depicting Eros as actively working on (or "mixing") the Ideas ( = "Source Craters"). Cf. ἐκέρασσεν, fr. 29 and notes; κράσας, fr. 44.

**4. πυρὸς ἄνθος**: Cf. *ibid.*, frr. 34, 35, 27.

## Fr. 43

**1. ἔρωτι (μὲν) βαθεῖ**: codd.; τὰ βαθή, cj. Saffrey-Westerink, who suggest that the βαθεῖ of the codd. is a corruption "by iotacism" caused by the falling away of τά and the attraction of ἔρωτι; see notes *ad loc.* But as Des Places notes (p. 131), the substitution of τὰ βαθή violates the meter.

**2. ἀναπλήσας τὴν ψυχήν**: codd.; ἀναπλώσας τῆς ψυχῆς, cj. Saffrey-Westerink (based on the ms. archetype). Thus, argue S.-W., the object of ἀναπλώσας would be τὰ βαθή, and the expression would parallel that of fr. 112: οἰγνύσθω ψυχῆς βάθος ἄμβροτον. Although this is an excellent conjecture, the problem of meter still necessitates the reading of the codices (and so the edition of Portus). In the context of Proclus, the soul is "filled with deep love" in an anagogic context. Cf. fr. 44; Lewy, p. 128 and n. 238.

## Fr. 44

**3. ψυχαῖον σπινθῆρα**: The notion of a "soul spark" which is akin to the Divine is pervasive in the Platonic tradition. See, e.g., Tardieu, "ΨΥΧΑΙΟΣ ΣΠΙΝΘΗΡ," pp. 225-255 for numerous parallels. Cf. Synesius, *H.* 1(3), 562: σπινθῆρα νόον. In the Chaldean system, the "spark of soul" is equivalent to the "fire/flame of mind" (e.g., frr. 1, 34, 35, 37, 42, 49).

**κράσας**: Cf. ἐκέρασσεν, fr. 29; κεράσσῃ, fr. 42.

**4. νῷ; νεύματι; ἔρωτα**: The problem here is νεύματι. Schol. *paris. gr.* (*loc. cit.*) has πνεύματι (which Kroll had already conjectured; and so Festugière, *Rév.*, III, pp. 57-58). On the basis of this evidence, Saffrey ("Nouveaux Oracles chaldaïques," p. 62) affirms πνεύματι as the correct reading. But Saffrey then does not make it clear whether he understands the fragment as referring to the composition of the World Soul or the human soul. Kroll argued for the former, as did Festugière, the latter identifying "Breath" (πνεύματι) with Eros (and, thus, suggesting a four-fold hierarchy in the Chaldean system; i.e., Father, Intellect, Breath-Eros, Hecate-World Soul). But both Theiler and Lewy understand the oracle in terms of the human soul. Theiler, however, (see "Porphyrios und Augustin," 1933, pp. 51-52 = 1966, pp. 224-225), conjectures νώματι ( = νοήματι) and sees a probable influence on the *mens*, *amor*, *notitia* triad of Augustine (as mediated through Porphyry). Hadot ("L'image de la Trinité," pp. 436-437) agrees with Theiler. But Lewy (I think rightly; see p. 180 and cf. p. 179, n. 8) prefers to keep the reading of Lydus and sees Kroll's and Theiler's conjectures as "unnecessary." In Lewy's summation (p. 180): "The Spark gives it (sc. the human soul) immortal life, the Intellect, the ability to think divine things, Will, the decision to descend to earth and to return from there to the realm of the noetic beings; finally, Eros, who binds together the parts of the soul, keeps alive the nostalgia for the divine." (Des Places, pp. 131-132, also keeps the reading of Lydus, but is then uncertain as how to interpret the oracle.)

But the oracle must refer to the human soul. If this is granted, then the reading πνεύματι becomes problematic, as this term is elsewhere identified with the soul's vehicle (cf. fr. 104 and notes) which is acquired in the soul's descent to earth (cf. fr. 61 and notes) and not as the result of any direct act on the part of the Father, which would be the case if πνεύματι is retained here. (Cf. Tardieu, "ΨΥΧΑΙΟΣ ΣΠΙΝΘΗΡ," pp. 243-245, who would also keep the reading πνεύματι and thus see ψυχή, νοῦς, and πνεῦμα as components of the human soul analogous to a similar triad of soul elements found in various Gnostic sources. But πνεῦμα, as a Gnostic term, is understood as the "spiritual" element of the soul (its highest part), not as the soul's "breath" or vehicle, as is the case with the *Oracles*.) Thus the evidence from *paris. gr.* is not conclusive. The copyist most likely *miscopied* Lydus' mss. here, and did not (as Saffrey suggests), find it "elsewhere" (either in the "original collection" of the *Oracles* or in a "lost citation" of another Neoplatonist). Such conjectures are unwarranted.

5. **συνδετικόν**: Cf. συνδέσμιον, fr. 42.

**ἐπιβήτορα**: Cf. ἐπιβήτορες, fr. 216.

## Fr. 45

2. **πνιγμόν**: The image is that of being "stifled" by the passions of the body (τὸν ὑβριστὴν ἔρωτα) under the influence of evil demons. See Lewy, pp. 264-265 and n. 17.

**ἔρωτος ἀληθοῦς**: This "true love" applies to the intelligible world. See Festugière, *Rép.*, III, p. 305, n. 2.

## Fr. 46

2. **πίστιν κἀλήθειαν καὶ ἔρωτα**: This triad comprises the chief virtues of the Chaldean system. As cosmic entities, Psellus (*Hypotyp.* 11) locates this triad just below the ἀμείλικτοι. Lewy (pp. 144-148 and notes 291-295; see, also, Cremer, pp. 56-60; 139-143) equates each of these virtues with the three Teletarchs: i.e., Faith with the Material Teletarch; Truth with the Ethereal Teletarch; Love with the Empyrean Teletarch. As such, each of these cosmic virtues has an added anagogic function (cf. fr. 48 and notes), as these three Rulers aid the ascent of the soul (cf. frr. 85 and 86). In this light, these Chaldean virtues should not be confused, e.g., with the Pauline triad of spiritual virtues (Faith, Hope, Charity). See discussion in Introduction.

## Fr. 47

2. **ἐλπίς**: This is a fourth virtue which probably formed a tetrad with Faith, Truth, and Love. Cf., e.g., Porphyry, *Ad Marc.* 24, who designates πίστις, ἀλήθεια, ἔρως, ἐλπίς, as τέσσαρα στοιχεῖα. (Proclus, *In Tim.*, I, 212, 21-22, also adds ἐλπίς to the verse cited *supra*, fr. 46.) In addition, Lewy (p. 147 and notes 296-298) suggests that this virtue may have an eschatological referent; i.e., the initiate into the Chaldean rites "hopes" (as in the terminology of the Mysteries) for a blessed after-life.

**πυρήοχος**: As a cosmic virtue, Hope ultimately derives from the Primal Fire or First Intellect (i.e., ἀπὸ νοῦ κατιοῦσαν). Cf., also, πυρήοχον, fr. 65.

## Fr. 48

**1. ἐν τρισὶ τοῖσδε**: i.e., in the three virtues of fr. 46.

**κυβερνᾶταί τε καὶ ἔστι**: In the context of Proclus, these three virtues are not only instrumental in founding the universe, but are responsible for turning all things back to the Divine. This is particularly the case with Eros: "Proclus' account of love...distinguishes two forms of love; the normal, Platonic 'ascending' form, motivating lower principles to aspire toward their superiors, and a 'descending' or 'providential' form, prompting these superiors to care for their products" (see Wallis, *Neoplatonism*, p. 154). Proclus' distinction, of course, derives from the *Oracles*; cf. frr. 42-44.

**2-3. διὰ τῆς τριάδος ταύτης κτλ.**: For Proclus, then, the three virtues perform a unifying or theurgic function. Cf., e.g., *Th. pl.*, I, 25; 113,3-8, S.-W.: πίστις καὶ ἀλήθεια καὶ ἔρως. Σώσεται δὲ πάντα διὰ τούτων καὶ συνάπτεται ταῖς πρωτουργοῖς αἰτίαις, τὰ μὲν διὰ τῆς ἐρωτικῆς μανίας, τὰ δὲ διὰ τῆς θείας φιλοσοφίας, τὰ δὲ διὰ τῆς θεουργικῆς δυνάμεως, ἣ κρείττων ἐστὶν ἁπάσης ἀνθρωπίνης σωφροσύνης καὶ ἐπιστήμης. However, unlike the *Oracles*, Proclus sees πίστις (not ἔρως) as the highest unifying or theurgic virtue. Cf., *In Alc.*, *loc. cit.*, l. 13: ἡ πίστις ἱδρύουσα τῶν ὄντων ἕκαστον ἐν τῷ ἀγαθῷ. See, also, O'Neill, *Proclus: Alc.* I, p. 33 and n. 106; Rosan, *Philosophy*, pp. 214-215; Rist, *Plotinus*, pp. 231-246.

## Fr. 49

**1. πατρογενὲς φάος**: A designation for Aion (or Eternity) who functions as the motion (= light) of the Highest God. (See Lewy, p. 101.) Lewy equates Aion with Chronos throughout the Chaldean system, but such an equation is problematic; see ἀκοιμήτου χρόνου, fr. 37 and notes. For Proclus, Aion was equated with the δύναμις or second moment of the Father (as a triadic Monad) and situated at the level of the second intelligible triad. See Lewy, Exc. VII, p. 483. Cf., also, Lydus, *De mens.*, II, 12; 36, 13-14 W.: τὸ ἀρχέτυπον εἶδος τοῦ νοητοῦ καὶ πατρογενοῦς αἰῶνος. See Hadot, *Porphyre*, I, pp. 385-386 and n. 1. Cf. πατρογενοῦς Ἑκάτης, fr. 35.

**2. τὸ ἑνοποιὸν φῶς**: Cf. (τὸ) ὅλον φῶς, fr. 59.

**3. ἁλκῆς**: Cf., esp., frr. 1, 2, 32, 82.

**4. δρεψάμενος νόου ἄνθος**: Cf. δρεπτόμεναι πυρὸς ἄνθος, fr. 37.

**πατρικὸν νοῦν**: Cf. frr. 39, 108, 109.

**5. πηγαῖς**: i.e., the sum of the Ideas considered as a whole; cf. πηγαίους κρατήρας, fr. 42. See Lewy, p. 111, n. 178.

**ἀρχαῖς**: i.e., the particular or divided world-shaping Ideas; cf. fr. 40; χρηνήϊος ἀρχή, fr. 74.

**6. δινεῖν**: Aion's function here is to keep the Ideas in constant motion. See Lewy, p. 100 and n. 143.

**αἰεί τε μένειν ἀόκνῳ στροφάλιγγι**: Cf. ἀκοιμήτῳ στροφάλιγγι, fr. 87, where this same expression applies to the Iynges (which are equated with the Ideas in the Chaldean system). Cf., also, στρόφαλον, fr. 206 and notes; μένειν ἀεὶ τῇ ἀόκνῳ στροφάλιγγι, fr. 12 (Damascius' commentary).

## Fr. 50

2. **μέσσον τῶν πατέρων**: Festugière, *Rév.* III, p. 57 (based on Neoplatonic exegesis), understands Hecate's position here as situated between the Paternal and Demiurgic Intellects (and thus equivalent to the δύναμις of the primordial triad); cf. τῶν πατέρων, fr. 16. Cf., also, Proclus, *In Tim.*, II, 129, 25-27: μέσην γὰρ καὶ ἐν τοῖς θεοῖς ἔχει χώραν ἡ τῆς ψυχῆς αἰτία θεός, ὡς δοκεῖ καὶ τοῖς θεολόγοις συναγωγὸς οὖσα τῶν δύο πατέρων. Lewy, however, (p. 142 and n. 283), understands τῶν πατέρων here as referring to the "Rulers" or "Fathers" of the three worlds. In this context, he identifies Hecate with the moon: "Hecate is named instead of the moon, her intramundane abode. The verse must, accordingly, be understood as identifying the 'center' of the moon with the 'midmost' of the three 'Fathers' (cf. fr. 73), that is to say, with the Ruler of the sun." Tardieu ("Oracles chaldaïques," pp. 214-215) appropriates both interpretations and demonstrates how the metaphysical interpretation (Father/Power/Intellect) is based on the physical model (Empyrean/Ethereal/Material Worlds). But to conclude, as does Tardieu, that the Chaldean structure is dependent on a similar Valentinian model is surely rash. A common Middle Platonic milieu best accounts for similarities here.

**Ἑκάτης κέντρον**: For Proclus, the "center of Hecate" designates ἡ ζωογόνος θεά (cf. fr. 32), the second term of Proclus' intellectual order. See Lewy, Exc. VII, p. 484; cf. p. 142, n. 283. Elsewhere in the *Oracles*, κέντρον is associated with the sun; e.g., frr. 70, 111, 167. Cf., also, Synesius, esp. *H.* 2(4), 99-100; 3(5), 65, where κέντρον is identified with the Holy Spirit as πνοιά ( = Chaldean δύναμις).

## Fr. 51

2. **ἡ πηγὴ τῶν ψυχῶν**: Here, πηγή designates the World Soul ( = Hecate). Cf. *ibid.*, fr. 56.

3. **δεξιτερῆς μὲν γὰρ λαγόνος περὶ χήραμα χόνδρων**: The image is obscure. Lewy (pp. 88-89 and n. 83) suggests an allusion to Hecate's statue on which hollows were depicted on both hips. Cf. Proclus, *In Tim.*, II, 260, 24-261,15; Festugière, *Tim.*, III, p. 304 and n. 3. See, also, Lewy, pp. 361-364 re the symbolic interpretation of statues.

4. **βλύζει**: Cf. ἔβλυσε, fr. 37.

5. **ἐμψυχοῦσα**: "Ensouling" is characteristic of Hecate; cf. ψυχοῦσα, fr. 53. In fr. 25, however, ἐψύχωτο is attributed to the Father, the ultimate source of all generation.

**φάος πῦρ αἰθέρα κόσμους**: Simplicius (*In phys.*, 613, 1-5) equates these terms, respectively, with the Paternal Monad, Empyrean, Ethereal, and Material Worlds (*contra* Proclus, who had interpreted the last three terms in apposition to φάος; cf. Des Places, "Notes," p. 325 ). Although Lewy (p. 89, n. 84) accepts Simplicius' interpretation, he argues that φάος must be equated with Aion and not the First God, as the latter generates the World Soul, and, thus, cannot be "ensouled" by her (as the oracle suggests). Tardieu, on the other hand ("Oracles chaldaïques," pp. 204-209), questions Lewy's "insertion of a mythological entity" (i.e., Aion) into a progression of physical elements. Tardieu prefers to combine the terms in this fragment with the list of elements in fr. 67 (fire, water, earth, air) to depict a descending progression from light to matter, with a mixture of fire, water, air, and earth between these two extremes.

Tardieu also demonstrates how both the Valentinian Gnostics, as well as the Chaldeans, developed numerous metaphysical patterns of structural oppositions based on this physical model. A case in point is the βυθός/βάθος equation of frr. 18 and 163. Cf., also, Hadot, *Porphyre*, I, pp. 396-398, who equates this progression of physical elements with a hierarchy of mythic powers (e.g., gods, angels, demons, heroes) who inhabit various levels of the physical universe.

## Fr. 52

**1. ἀρετῆς**: In Lewy's interpretation (pp. 88-90), a cosmic power associated with the moon (cf. ἀρετή, fr. 107) and thus with Hecate, whose dwelling place is the moon. By remaining "within," "virtue" remains uncontaminated by the Material World.

**πέλε**: Common to the *Oracles*; cf. frr. 69, 97, 214.

**2. τὸ παρθένον**: Cf. Hadot, *Porphyre*, I, p. 275 and n. 6, who points out the "paradoxical" virginal/maternal nature of Hecate. Psellus, *P.G.*, 1136 b 9-10, alludes to Hecate's statue: ζωστῆρι κοσμηθεῖσα παρθενικῷ. Cf. ὑπεζωκώς, fr. 6 and notes.

## Fr. 53

**1. τὰς μεριστὰς τοῦ δημιουργοῦ νοήσεις**: "Division" is characteristic of the Ideas. Cf. ἐμερίσθησαν and μεμερισμέναι, fr. 37.

**2. πατρικὰς διανοίας**: Cf. ἔννοιαι νοεραί, fr. 37; ἔννοια πατρός, fr. 38. But cf. Festugière, *Rév.*, III, p. 58 who equates this expression with the "Fathers" of fr. 50 (and not with the Ideas).

**3. ψυχή**: i.e., the World Soul, whose position here mediates between the intelligible and sensible realms. See Lewy, p. 85 and n. 70.

**θέρμῃ**: Cf. fr. 123, where "heat" is said to be an anagogic power. Hecate's "heat," of course, derives from the noetic fire of the Father.

**ψυχοῦσα**: Lewy, *op. cit.*, sees a play on words here between θέρμῃ and ψυχοῦσα, as the latter can also mean "to cool." Cf. Iambl., *De myst.*, II.6: ἡ μὲν τῶν θεῶν παρουσία...τὸ μὲν ψυχρὸν ἐν ἡμῖν...ἀφανίζει, τὸ δὲ θέρμον αὔξει. See Cremer, pp. 50-51.

## Fr. 54

**1. θεολόγοι**: i.e., the *Juliani*. However, this term is also used by the later Neoplatonists when referring to the Orphic tradition. See Lewy, Exc. I, p. 444 d.

**τῇ ζῳογόνῳ...θεῷ**: Cf. τὸν ζῳογόνον κόλπον (of Hecate), fr. 32; τῆς ζῳογόνου πηγῆς Ῥέας, fr. 56, intro.

**ὑπέστησαν**: cj. Kroll; προϋπέστησαν, cj. Cousin.

**2. φύσις**: Although Lewy (pp. 90 and n. 91; 95-96) equates Hecate with Nature, it is more precise to think of Nature as proceeding from Hecate. Cf., e.g., Proclus, *In Tim.*, I, 11, 19-20: τοιαύτη οὖσα (ἡ φύσις) προελήλυθεν ἀπὸ τῆς ζῳογόνου θεᾶς. See, also, Festugière, *Tim.*, I, p. 38 and n. 1. Cf., also, forms of φύσις in frr. 70, 88, 101, 102, 106.

## Fr. 55

1. **χαῖται μὲν γὰρ ἐς ὀξὺ κτλ.**: Lewy (pp. 90-91 and notes 94-96) suggests that this verse alludes to a popular notion that Hecate's hair was made up of snakes, and attempts to connect this interpretation with his understanding of εἰλυμένον in fr. 38. Festugière, *Rép.*, I, p. 156, n. 4, prefers to emend the text to: χαῖται μὲν γὰρ ἐς ὀξὺ πεφρικότα φῶτα βλέπουσιν and translates: "sa chevelure semble celle d'un homme aux cheveux hérisses."

## Fr. 56

1. **τῆς ζῳογόνου πηγῆς Ῥέας**: Here, it is Rhea who functions as a generative, World Soul figure. Elsewhere, both ζῳογόνος (frr. 32 and 54) and πηγή (fr. 52) are descriptive of Hecate.

3. **Ῥείη**: Lewy (p. 84, notes 65 and 66, *contra* Proclus) argues that this term does not refer to Rhea, but is the feminine of ῥᾷδιος (and so the pun ῥείη/ῥοή). For Lewy, "Rhea does not figure in the Chaldean panthenon." (Cf., Hadot, *Porphyre*, I, p. 396, n. 2, who agrees with Lewy.) Lewy translates v. 1 as: "The Source and Stream of the spiritual Blessed ones is easy-flowing." But Festugière (*Tim.*, V, p. 117, n. 1) argues that "le sens ne peut être que Rhea, et, s'il y a erreur, elle aura consisté à prendre pour chaldaïques des λόγια orphiques." Rhea, of course, figures in a number of Orphic fragments. See Kern, *Orph. Frag.*, Index III. Of particular interest is frag. 132: ἐν τοῖς κόλποις τῆς Ῥέας. Damascius (II, 277, 5), who cites this fragment, attributes it to Orpheus. Although Kroll, *loc. cit.*, and Des Places, p. 134, argue for a Chaldean origin (and, to be sure, the vocabulary of the oracle certainly fits a Chaldean milieu), an unqualified acceptance of Rhea as a bona-fide Chaldean deity remains problematic. Psellus, for example, only mentions Hecate, not Rhea, in his summary of the Chaldean system.

**νοερῶν μακάρων**: According to Lewy (p. 159, n. 350), a reference to the planetary gods. Cf. frr. 140 and 160.

**ῥοή**: This image of "streaming" or "flowing" is frequent in the Oracles in a variety of contexts. Cf. ῥέει, fr. 31; ῥεύσωμεν, fr. 171; ῥοιζαῖον, fr. 146; ἐρροίζησε and ῥοιζοῦνται, fr. 37; ῥοῖζον, fr. 107; ῥοαί, fr. 61.

4. **πρώτη δυνάμει**: Elsewhere, Power is assigned the median role in the primordial triad and is equated with Hecate. Cf. frr. 4, 50, 96 and notes. Lewy, however, (p. 159, n. 350), understands πηγή...πρώτη δυνάμει as referring to the Paternal Intellect from which the planetary gods emanate (based on his translation of v. 1; see *supra*. Lewy identifies the "Source and Stream" with the Paternal Intellect.)

**κόλποισιν**: This term is associated both with the World Soul (e.g., frr. 32, 35, 37, 96) and the fecundating power of the Father (e.g., fr. 28; cf. μήτρα, fr. 30).

5. **πᾶν**: Cf. τὰ πάντα, fr. 23 and notes.

**προχέει**: Cf. ἐπιρρεῖ, fr. 32 and notes.

**τροχάουσαν**: Cf. τροχάζει, fr. 13.

## Fr. 57

**2. ἑπτὰ στερεώματα κοσμῶν**: The seven planetary spheres. Psellus, *P.G.*, 122, 1149 c, apparently conflates these spheres with the three worlds and comes up with ἑπτὰ σωματικοὺς κόσμους: i.e., 1 Empyrean, 3 Ethereal, 3 Material. Cf., also, Damascius, II, 88, 21-24; Lewy, p. 123 and notes 218-219.

**ἐξώγκωσε**: A vivid description of the world-shaping activity of the Second Intellect. Lewy (p. 123) translates "set up on high;" Des Places (p. 81) prefers "souffla." Cf. *C.H.* X.15: ὄγκωτο; ὠγκωμένου (with reference to the "volume" of the soul as it descends through the planetary spheres).

**πατήρ**: Here, the Second or Demiurgic Intellect. Cf. πατέρων, frr. 16 and 50.

## Fr. 58

**1. ἐμεσεμβόλησεν**: Cf. μεσεμβολήσας, fr. 200.

**4. κραδίης τοπῷ**: In Chaldean cosmology, the sun was situated in the middle of the seven spheres as the "heart" or "center" of the Universe. Cf. κέντρον, fr. 70; κέντρῳ, fr. 111. See, also, Lewy, pp. 124, n. 221 d; 409-413; Des Places, p. 82 and "Notes," p. 325; Geudtner, pp. 55-56; Tardieu, "Oracles chaldaïques," p. 195 ff. As such, the Chaldean order of the planets follows the "new cosmology" developed during the Hellenistic period. See, e.g., Nilsson, *Greek Piety*, pp. 96-103.

## Fr. 59

**1. οἱ...μυστικώτατοι τῶν λόγων**: A circumlocution for the *Oracles*; see Lewy, Exc. I, p. 444 e.

**ἐν τοῖς ὑπερκοσμίοις (κοσμοῖς)**: ( = fr. 209). For the later Neoplatonists, the term "supermundane" could apply both to the Empyrean and/or Ethereal Worlds. Cf. τὸν ὑπερουράνιον τόπον, fr. 16, intro.; ὑπέρκοσμον πατρικὸν βύθον, fr. 18. Cf., also, fr. 193 and notes.

**3. (ὁ) ἡλιακὸς κόσμος (καὶ τὸ) ὅλον φῶς**: Synonymous expressions for the transmundane sun of the intelligible world ( = Aion). As such, this noetic sun is the transmundane "copy" on which the visible sun is patterned. See Lewy, pp. 151-152 and n. 313. See, also, Proclus, *El. Th.*, prop. 52: πᾶν τὸ αἰώνιον ὅλον ἅμα ἐστίν. In Dodds' words: "Wholeness is intermediate in the logical order of universality, and therefore for Pr. [*sic*] in the metaphysical order also...It is associated with eternity...which occupies a similar intermediate position between Being and the eternals." See Dodds, *Proclus: El. Th.*, p. 239; cf. Festugière, *Tim*, IV, p. 110, n. 5.

## Fr. 60

**2. πυρὸς ἐξοχέτευμα**: A reference to the rays of the sun, which function in both a physical as well as anagogic sense in the *Oracles*. Cf. ἐμπυρίοις ὀχετοῖς, fr. 2; πυρήοχον, fr. 65; ὀχετῶν, fr. 66.

**4. ταμίαν**: The visible sun is the "dispenser" of heat and light for the earth. In hymns to Helios, ταμίας is used regularly with either πῦρ or φῶς. (See, Lewy, pp. 154-155 and notes 324-329, who sees such hymns as influencing the *Oracles*.) Cf., also, Synesius, *H.* 1(3), 36, 693; 2(4), 182; 8(9), 71; 9(1), 53.

## Fr. 61

**3. δρόμος**: A technical term for the movement of the stars. Cf. frr. 70 and 73; *infra*, l. 18 ( = v. 11). Cf., also, Synesius, *H.* 1(3), 31: μάνας τε δρόμοι. See Lewy, p. 140, n. 276.

**5. ἠέριοί τε ῥοαί**: i.e., the winds. Cf. ἠέρος ἀγοί, *infra*, l. 7 ( = v. 3); Synesius, *H.* 2(4), 35: ἀνέμων ῥοῖζος. See, also, ῥοή, fr. 56 and notes.

**7. πνεῦμα σελήνης**: Cf., esp., fr. 35 and notes, where πνεῦμα is associated with the World Soul (or Hecate, whose abode is the moon).

**ἠέρος ἀγοί**: i.e, the winds. Lewy (p. 185 and n. 35) sees this verse as the beginning of a ὕμνος κλητικός. In this regard, cf. fr. 216.

**9. μηναίων καναχισμῶν**: Cf., esp., μήνης ῥοῖζον, fr. 107.

**10. κόλπων τ' ἠερίων**: Cf. κόλποι ἠέριοι, fr. 216.

**12-15. αἴθρης...συννήχονται**: These verses refer to the raiments (ethereal, solar, lunar, aerial) acquired by the soul in its descent to earth. These raiments make up the "vehicle" of the soul. And so Proclus, *In Tim.*, III, 234, 26-30: καὶ δοκοῦσιν ἕπεσθαι τοῖς λογίοις ἐν τῇ καθόδῳ τὴν ψυχὴν λέγουσι συλλέγειν αὐτὸ (i.e., τὸ ὄχημα τῆς ψυχῆς) λαμβάνουσαν "αἴθρης μέρος ἠελίου" κτλ. On the "vehicle" of the soul, see frr. 104, 119-120, 129, 158, 210 and notes (as well as sources cited in n. 84 of Introduction). Cf., also, Hadot, *Porphyre*, I, p. 182 and n. 1.

**14. {μέρος}**: As Des Places notes (p. 134), μέρος here does not fit the meter.

**18. μηναῖός τε δρόμος**: Cf. μηναῖόν τε δρόμημα, fr. 64.

## Fr. 62

This fragment (as well as frr. 91 and 208) is now attributed to Damascius, not Olympiodorus. See Westerink, *Greek Comm.*, II, p. 15 ff.

**2. τῶν στοιχείων**: The stars. Cf. κόσμου στοιχεῖα, fr. 39; Lewy, p. 97, n. 131. In the context of Damascius, however, the "elements" mentioned here refer to water and air.

**αἰθέρες**: A possible allusion to the ethereal raiments of the soul. Cf. fr. 61; Lewy, p. 193, n. 64. Westerink, however, note *loc. cit.*, suggests that the word αἰθέρες alludes here to the "highest heavens" or Empyrean World, and that Damascius has transferred this expression to the elements, water and air, "to denote the highest and most refined part of each." Westerink also thinks it is doubtful that the terms στοιχεῖα and αἰθέρες were ever connected in the *Oracles*, citing Proclus, *In Tim.*, II, 57, 12-14 as evidence.

**3. ἐκεῖ**: In the context of Damascius, ἐπ' ἄκρων τῆς γῆς.

## Fr. 63

**2. κυρτῷ σχήματι**: In the context of Damascius, a possible allusion to the magical characters or signs used during some of the theurgic rites. (See Lewy, p. 252, n. 91.) Proclus (*In Tim.*, I, 317, 22-25) also appropriates this expression, but in a cosmological context: δοκεῖ μὲν οὖν ὅσα τῷ τρίτῳ τῶν ἀρχικῶν ὁ θεουργὸς ἀνατίθησι, ταῦτα καὶ οὗτος τῷ κόσμῳ διδόναι καὶ δημιουργεῖν μὲν τὸν οὐρανὸν, "κυρτῷ σχήματι" περικλάσας. See Festugière, *Tim.*, II, 175, n. 1, who draws a parallel with Plato, *Tim.* 33 b.

**συρομένην**: Cf. frr. 34, 164.

## Fr. 64

**3. μηναῖόν τε δρόμημα**: Cf. μηναῖός τε δρόμος, fr. 61.

**ἀστέριον προπόρευμα**: Cf. *ibid.*, fr. 107. Proclus uses our fr. 64 to support Plato's theory concerning the forward motion of the fixed stars in contrast to the forward and retrograde movements of the planets.

## Fr. 65

Lewy (pp. 153-154 and notes 320-328) understands these obscure verses as referring to the activity of the visible sun: "The five attributes prove that this fire designates the sun. For this luminary is situated in the fifth of the spheres, if these, including that of the fixed stars, are counted from above; it is the midmost of the seven planets, in contradistinction from the noetic fire, it is called the other; it contains the transcendental fire, it is life-bringing...This solar fire descends from the transcendent fire in channels which attain the region of the material world and bring through their warmth life to the earth."

**1. κέντρου**: Cf. forms of κέντρον in fr. 50 (with reference to Hecate); frr. 70, 111, 167 (with reference to the sun).

ζῳογονίας: Cf. ζῳογόνον, fr. 32 (with reference to Hecate); ζῳογόνου, fr. 56 (with reference to Rhea).

**4. ἄλλο πυρήοχον**: The term "other" characterizes the "fire" (or sun) of the material world as distinguished from its noetic counterpart. Cf., similarly, πῦρ ἕτερον, fr. 6; πυρὸς ὄγκος...ἕτερος, fr. 68. Cf., also, πυρήοχον, fr. 47 (with reference to the virtue "Hope").

**5. ὑλαίων ὀχετῶν**: i.e., the rays of the mundane sun which reach the earth. Cf., also, frr. 2, 66, 110 where forms of ὀχετός are used in an anagogic sense.

**ζωηφόριον πῦρ**: Cf. πυρὸς ζωηφόρου, fr. 32 (with reference to the Paternal Intellect). Cf., also, Synesius, *H.* 1(3), 601-602: φωτὸς ζωηφορίου (in an anagogic context). See, also, Hadot, *Porphyre*, I, p. 402 and n. 11.

## Fr. 66

**1. μιγνυμένων δ' ὀχετῶν**: i.e., a "mingling" of the ascending soul "spark" or "channel" with the mystic rays of the sun. Cf. Synesius, *H.* 1(3), 720: φωτὶ μιγῆναι; 727: φωτὶ μιγεῖσαν; 3(5), 47: μιχθῆναι ψυχᾶς παγᾷ. Cf., also, μιγῆναι, fr. 6 (in a cosmic context).

**πυρὸς ἀφθίτου ἔργα**: An allusion to the sacred activity of the theurgist. Cf. ἔργον, fr. 110 and notes; πυρὸς ἔργα, fr. 133. Cf., also, Synesius, *H.* 1(3), 639-641: πυρίων δ' ἔργων. Lewy (pp. 196-197 and notes 79-83) understands this verse as referring to the final purification of the soul; i.e., that of the higher or rational soul (via the "divine work" of the theurgist). But this assessment must be qualified by the noetic language of, e.g., fr. 1, which suggests some form of genuine contemplative activity (free of external manipulation) at the level of the higher soul. See notes to fr. 1 and detailed discussion in Introduction.

**2. (ἡ ἀκροτάτη ζωή)**: In the context of Proclus, it is a matter of the poetic life (ἡ ποιητικὴ ζωή) at its most perfect level; i.e., when the soul is "filled with the Divine" (πλήρης τῶν θείων). See A. Sheppard, *Studies on the 5th and 6th Essays of Proclus' Commentary on the Republic*, esp. pp. 171-182, for an excellent discussion of this material in the context of Proclus' theory of mysticism.

## Fr. 67

**1. ἡ τῶν Ἀσσυρίων θεολογία**: Another circumlocution for the Chaldean tradition. See Lewy, Exc. I, p. 444 c.

**3. πυρός; ὕδατος; γῆς; αἴθρης** (= **ἀήρ**): The four elements from which the sublunar world is fashioned. Cf. Psellus, *Hypotyp.* 27, where ὕλη πατρογενής signifies the primal substratum, and τέτταρα στοιχεῖα indicates the four elements

from which ὁ σύμπας κόσμος is shaped. (Cf., *Hypotyp.* 20: τὰ δὲ ὑπὸ σελήνην ἐν τοῖς τέταρσι στοιχείοις ὑφέστηκεν). See Lewy, p. 119 and notes 202-203; Des Places, "Notes," p. 326; Hadot, *Porphyre*, I, p. 396 and n. 7; Tardieu, "Oracles chaldaïques," p. 204 ff., who constructs a structural model in conjunction with fr. 51.

## Fr. 68

**1 + 3. αὐτουργῶν**: Cf. Numenius, fr. 16 (Des Places): ὁ γὰρ δεύτερος διττὸς ὢν αὐτοποιεῖ τήν τε ἰδέαν ἑαυτοῦ καὶ τὸν κόσμον δημιουργὸς ὤν. Cf., also, *C.H.* XI.14: αὐτουργὸς γὰρ ὤν, ἀεί ἐστιν ἐν τῷ ἔργῳ αὐτὸς ὢν ὃ ποιεῖ; Synesius, *H.* 1(3), 268: αὐτουργὲ θεῶν.

**2. ὅτις πυρὸς ὄγκος ἕτερος**: A reference to the mundane sun. Cf. ἄλλο πυρήοχον, fr. 65. Lewy, however, (p. 120 and n. 205; cf. p. 154) ignores the context of Proclus and makes this phrase the subject of the fragment.

**3. σῶμα τὸ κοσμικόν**: The "world body" comprised of the four elements. Cf. κόσμου περὶ σώμασιν, fr. 37.

**4. μὴ φαίνηθ' ὑμενώδης**: In other words, the visible world (as opposed to the intelligible world) must be solid and corporeal, a notion derived from a similar description in Plato, *Tim.*, 31 b. In both instances, it is the element of fire which makes the world invisible. See Lewy, p. 120 and n. 206. Cf. ὑμήν, fr. 6.

## Fr. 69

**1. (ὁ οὐρανός)**: Although Proclus, *loc. cit.*, equates ὁ οὐρανός with ὁ κόσμος (based on his interpretation of Plato, *Tim.*, 28 b), in the *Oracles*, "sky" is more properly the region of the fixed stars or Ethereal realm. Cf. οὐρανός, fr. 70; Lewy, pp. 125-126 and notes 225-227.

**σῶμα ἔχων**: Cf. *ibid.*, Plato, *Tim.*, 28 b.

**2. νοῦ μίμημα**: i.e., the corporeal sky is patterned after its intelligible copy. Cf. Plato, *ibid.*

**πέλει**: Common to the *Oracles*; cf., e.g., frr. 52, 97, 214.

**3-4. τι/σώματος**: As a visible entity, the sky ( = Ethereal World) is involved in matter, although not to the extent of the sublunar world, which is characterized as μισοφαής (frr. 134 and 181) and μελαναυγής (fr. 163).

## Fr. 70

**2. ἀπηωρῆσθαι**: Cf. ἠώρηται, fr. 54.

**3. φύσις**: Lewy (pp. 95-96 and n. 126) identifies "Nature" with Hecate. However, as Festugière suggests (see fr. 54 and notes), it is better to think of Nature as deriving or proceeding from Hecate (or "suspended from the great Hecate" as stated here).

**κόσμων**: i.e., the stars. Cf., e.g., κόσμοις, fr. 8; Festugière, *Tim.*, I, p. 38, n. 3.

**ἔργων**: i.e., visible creation as a whole. Cf. αἰσθητοῖς ἔργοις, fr. 40; Lewy, p. 96, n. 128. Festugière, *ibid.* (and thus Des Places), translates "toute creature." See, also, Proclus, *In Tim.*, I, 11, 28-30, where the first two verses of this oracle are also quoted.

**4. οὐρανός**: The region of the fixed stars. Cf. fr. 69; Lewy, p. 96, n. 129.

**δρόμον**: This term is regularly applied to the movement of the stars. Cf. δρόμος, fr. 61 and notes for parallels.

**κατασύρων**: Cf. συρόμενος, fr. 34 and notes for parallels. See, also, Lewy, p. 96, n. 130.

**5. κέντρον**: Here, a reference to the sun's position in the "center" of the universe. Cf. frr. 111 and 167; κραδίης, fr. 58. Lewy (pp. 96-97) thinks the term "center" here refers to the earth, but κέντρον is never used in this sense in any of the extant fragments.

## Fr. 71

**1. (Ἀπόλλων)**: Synonymous with Helios.

**2. ἁρμονίᾳ**: Cf. Proclus, *H.* I.4 (εἰς Ἥλιον): ὑψόθεν ἁρμονίης ῥύμα πλούσιον ἐξοχετεύων. Cf., also, ἁρμονίαν, fr. 97; Synesius, *H.* 1(3), 341; 8(9), 37. In Lewy's words (p. 200 and n. 100): "According to the Chaldean doctrine, the sun, as the center of the planetary world, holds the spheres together with its rays, and thereby watches over the harmonious relationship of the revolving spheres."

## Fr. 72

**2-3. πανοπλίᾳ παντελεῖ κεκοσμημένην**: The reference is to Plato, *Laws*, VII, 796 c 1, where this expression is descriptive of Athena. See Lewy, p. 95 and n. 118.

**4. ἥκα θεείη**: The "goddess" of the oracle is undoubtedly Hecate, who has been conjured by the theurgist (and was often depicted as armed). Cf. frr. 219, 221-223; Lewy, p. 95 and n. 119.

## Fr. 73

**1. οὗτος ὁ Ζεύς**: In the context of Damascius, a reference to ὁ ἀρχικὸς Ζεύς. The passage as a whole is a commentary on Plato, *Phaedrus*, 246 e-247 a.

**2. τρεῖς πατέρας**: Equivalent to ἀρχαῖς τρισί, *infra*, l. 5 ( = v. 3), as a probable allusion to the Rulers of the three worlds. See Lewy, pp. 138-139.

**3-4. ἱερὸς πρῶτος δρόμος, ἐν δ' ἄρα μέσσῳ ἠέριος, τρίτος ἄλλος ὃς ἐν πυρὶ τὴν χθόνα θάλπει**: These three "courses" have been subject to various interpretations. Kroll, for example, *loc. cit.*, was puzzled by these lines, so emended the text to read: ἔστι γὰρ αἰθέριος πρῶτος δρόμος, ἐν δ' ἄρα μέσσῳ ἠέριος, τρίτος ἄλλος, etc. (based on Damascius' introductory comments. Cremer, p. 39, also accepts Damascius' interpretation of the "first course" as "heavenly" = ethereal.) However, Kroll's emendations (among other problems), eliminate the crucial ἱερός in v. 1 which, as Lewy points out (p. 140, n. 277), has a transmundane or noetic (not ethereal) association. But Lewy (pp. 139-140 and n. 275), although noting this, leaves out a crucial comma after ἠέριος and thus understands the "third course" (and not the "middle course") as "airy." In doing so, Lewy extends the meaning of the second verse to read: "The third, airy course heats the earth in the fire (of the second course)." In addition, Lewy connects the "sacred course" with Aion ( = transmundane sun), the "median course" with the mundane sun, the "airy course" with the moon. Although Lewy's general association of the three courses with the three worlds is undoubtedly correct, his translation of the fragment is unnecessarily forced. (Note that Des Places, p. 136, accepts Lewy's interpretations, but then does not suppress the comma after ἠέριος!)

Tardieu, on the other hand ("Oracles chaldaïques," pp. 213-214), translates the fragment in the most obvious way (i.e., a "first, sacred course;" a "median" airy course; a "third course which heats the earth in fire"), but then mistakenly connects the "airy course" with the Ethereal World and the "third, other course" with the Material World (the problem Lewy attempted to correct with his translation). In the extant fragments, "airy" is regularly associated with the moon and, thus, with the Material (not Ethereal) World. (Cf., e.g., the sequence in fr. 61: ether, sun, moon, air.) Similarly, the "third, other course which heats the earth in fire" must allude to the sun, which rules the Ethereal (not Material) World. (Cf. ἄλλο, fr. 65; ἕτερος, fr. 68. But Tardieu's understanding of Chaldean cosmology as based on the Stoic doctrine of "three fires" may well be correct.) Thus, none of the solutions so far proposed is entirely satisfactory. The fragment, as it stands, remains a puzzle.

**5. ἀρχαῖς γὰρ τρισὶ ταῖσδε κτλ.**: For Lewy, ἀρχαῖς τρισί is analogous to τρεῖς πατέρας (see *supra*, l. 2). Cremer, however (p. 73, n. 294), challenges this interpretation and translates ἀρχαῖς as "Principles" (with an allusion to the Iynges). But Cremer's interpretation is erroneously based on Damascius, II, 201, 2-4 (see fr. 78 and notes). As Lewy has correctly shown (p. 140, n. 274), the verb δουλεύει demands the sense of "ruler" here, and not "principle."

## Fr. 74

**1. ἀπορρεῖν**: Cf. ἐπιρρεῖ, fr. 32; προχέει, fr. 56.

**2. κρηνήϊος ἀρχή**: Cf. Psellus, *Hypotyp.* 28: ἑκάστης δὲ σειρᾶς ἡ ἀκρότης πηγὴ ὀνομάζεται, τὰ δὲ προσεχῆ κρῆναι. All of these expressions—πηγαί (see fr. 49); ἀρχαί (see frr. 40, 49); κρῆναι—ultimately refer to the Ideas. See Lewy, pp. 115-116 and notes 192-193.

**3. ὑμνεῖται**: Evidently the fragment constituted part of a Chaldean hymn.

## Fr. 75

**2. αὐταῖς**: The feminine here alludes to the Iynges (αἱ ἴυγγες; cf. fr. 76; and so Des Places, p. 136; cf. Chaignet, *Damascius*, II, p. 281) and not the Teletarchs (οἱ τελετάρχαι; cf. frr. 85 and 86) as Lewy thought (p. 141, n. 281, who translates the verse as: "The ruling path subject to the Teletarchs").

**ἀρχικός**: cj. Des Places; ἄρχιος, codd. Cf. Chaignet, *ibid.*, n. 1: "genitif d'un nom ἄρχις, pour ἀρχή ou ἀρχικός."

**αὐλών**: According to Lewy (*op. cit.*), synonymous with δρόμος as a technical term for the movement of the stars (cf. δρόμος, fr. 61). But αὐλών is not attested elsewhere in this sense. The fragment remains obscure.

## Fr. 76

**1. τὰς ἴυγγας**: Here, the Iynges function as noetic entities equivalent to the Thoughts or Ideas of the Father (cf. fr. 77). As noetic entities, Proclus locates αἱ ἴυγγες at the first level of the νοητὴ καὶ νοερὰ διάκοσμος. See Lewy, Exc. VII, p. 483. Elsewhere (e.g., fr. 206), this term refers to the "magic wheels" used in the theurgic rites. See discussion in Introduction.

**2. ἐπεμβαίνουσι**: Cf., *nomen agentis*, ἐπιβήτορα, fr. 44 (with reference to Eros). Both the Iynges and Eros function as "binding" entities in the Chaldean

system. See Geudtner, pp. 42-47 and discussion in Introduction. Cf., also, ἐπιβήτορες, fr. 216 (here, with reference to lunar demons).

**3. κόσμοις ἐνθρῴσκουσαι**: Cf. κόσμων ἐνθρῴσκων, fr. 34; κόσμοις ἐνθρῴσκον, fr. 87; ἐκθρῴσκουσιν, fr. 35. Thus the Iynges, like the Ideas (as "thunderbolts"), "leap into the worlds" as fiery entities.

**3-4. ἀκρότητες τρεῖς**: According to Lewy (p. 156; cf. p. 134, n. 256), another term for the Iynges, who were associated with the three world circles. Cf. ἀκρότητας, fr. 82.

**4. <πυρίη γ' ἠδ' αἰθερίη καὶ ὑλώδης>**: cj. Lewy, p. 132, n. 250. Cf. Psellus, *Hypotyp.* 3: μεθ' ἣν τρεῖς ἑτέρας (sc. ἴυγγας) πατρικὰς καὶ νοητὰς καὶ ἀφθέγκτους, διαιρούσας τοὺς κόσμους τριχῇ κατὰ τὸ ἐμπύριον καὶ τὸ αἰθέριον καὶ τὸ ὑλαῖον. Cf., also, *Hypotyp.* 5.

## Fr. 77

**1. αἵ γε**: cj. Lewy; ἴυγγες, codd. But it is Psellus who has introduced ἴυγγες here. See Lewy, p. 132, n. 249.

**νοούμεναι <ἐκ> πατρόθεν**: ἐκ, cj. Lewy; cf. ἐκ πατρόθεν, fr. 130. As Ideas, the Iynges are "thought" by the Paternal Intellect.

**2. βουλαῖς ἀφθέγκτοις**: Cf., esp., ἀκμάδι βουλῇ, fr. 37; πειθηνίδι βουλῇ, fr. 81; ἀϊδίῳ βουλῇ, fr. 107.

**κινούμεναι**: The "movement" of the Iynges is their "leap" into the worlds (see fr. 76). This movement is a circular motion away from and back towards the Father (cf. fr. 87) and, as such, constitutes their "thinking." See Geudtner, p. 43.

## Fr. 78

**1. οἱ ἐπὶ μαγειῶν πατέρες**: i.e., the Teletarchs or Rulers of the three worlds who play a role in the theurgic rites (ἐπὶ μαγειῶν). See Lewy, p. 139 and n. 274.

**3. διαπόρθμιοι**: These "couriers" are the Iynges. (Cf. Proclus, *In Crat.*, 33, 14: τὸ διαπόρθμιον ὄνομα τῶν ἰύγγων.) Damascius, however, has mistakenly applied this term to the "three fathers." (See Lewy, p. 133 and n. 254.) Cremer, however (pp. 73-74 and notes 295-296), accepts Damascius' interpretation. (See, also, notes to fr. 73.) As "couriers," the Iynges transmit messages between the intelligible and sensible worlds (τῷ πατρὶ καὶ τῇ ὕλῃ). But these messages are none other than their own magical names. (Cf. ὄνομα σεμνόν, fr. 87.) See, also, Synesius, *H.* 1(3), 105-107: μελέτω προπόλοις/πορθμεῦσι σοφοῖς/ἁγίων ὕμνων; Geudtner, pp. 44-45.

## Fr. 79

**1. πᾶς κόσμος**: Either a reference to the three worlds (cf. παντὶ ἐν κόσμῳ, fr. 27) or, more likely, to the stars (cf., e.g., κόσμοις, frr. 8 and 76). See Lewy, p. 135, n. 259. Psellus, however, *loc. cit.*, understands the "universe" in a general sense.

**ἀνοχῆας**: Noetic entities associated with the Iynges. Cf., e.g., Proclus, *In Crat.*, 33, 14-15: τὸ διαπόρθμιον ὄνομα τῶν ἰύγγων, ὃ πάσας ἀνέχειν λέγεται τὰς πηγάς. As such, these "Supports" play a crucial role in maintaining the regular movement of the spheres.

**ἀκαμπεῖς**: Cf. ἄγναμπτον, fr. 36.

## Fr. 80

**3. ὑλαίοις συνοχεῦσιν**: These "Material Connectors" are equivalent to the rays of the mundane sun. See Lewy, pp. 131, n. 246; 155-156.

**δουλεύει**: Common to the *Oracles*; cf. frr. 73, 81, 184.

## Fr. 81

**1-2. τῆς νοητῆς ἐκείνης καὶ νοερᾶς τάξεως**: For Proclus, the median order (or ὁ δεύτερος διάκοσμος) situated between the intelligible and intellectual orders (see Lewy, Exc. VII, p. 483). In the context of Proclus, the operative principle (for which he cites the oracular fragment) is that of dominance and dependence, i.e., each entity or divine being dominates the principle below it but, at the same time, is dependent or subservient to the principle above it.

**3. πυρὸς νοεροῦ**: Here, apparently the Father or First Intellect. But cf. νοερῷ πυρί, fr. 37, where this term indicates the Second Intellect.

**νοεροῖς πρηστῆρσιν**: The Ideas; cf. πρηστήρ, fr. 34; πρηστῆρσιν, fr. 82.

**4. δουλεύοντα**: Since this verb is used *supra* (fr. 80) in connection with the Connectors, it is possible that the "Lightning-bolts" can be assimilated to the Connectors in some sense. (Cf. fr. 82.) In the last analysis, the συνοχεῖς, πρηστῆρες, ἀμείλικτοι, ἀνοχήεις, and ἴυγγες all function as diverse aspects of the class of Ideas. See Lewy, p. 156.

**πειθηνίδι βουλῇ**: Cf. πειθώ, fr. 14; βουλῇ, fr. 37 and notes.

## Fr. 82

**3. φρουρεῖν πρηστῆρσιν**: This function of "protecting" is also assigned to the Connectors and Implacables. Cf., e.g., Psellus, *Hypotyp.* 10: οἱ δὲ ἀμείλικτοι, ὑποδεξάμενοι τὴν πρηστήριον τῶν συνοχέων δύναμιν, φρουροῦσι τὰς ὑπάρξεις ἄνωθεν τῶν πατέρων.

**ἀκρότητας**: The "summits" are associated with the Iynges. Cf. ἀκρότητες, fr. 76.

**4. ἐγκεράσας**: This "mixing" metaphor is common to the *Oracles*; cf. frr. 29, 42, 44.

**ἀλκῆς**: "Strength" is a regular epithet of the Father; cf., esp., frr. 1, 2, 32, 49.

**ἴδιον**: Cf. *ibid.*, fr. 3, where this term is similarly descriptive of the Father.

**συνοχεῦσιν**: Here, probably analogous to πρηστῆρσιν, *supra*, l. 3 (= v. 1).

## Fr. 83

**2. ὁλοποιοί**: Lewy (p. 155, n. 331) understands this term as a Chaldean neologism comprised of ὅλος + ποιόω and thus translates as "endowed with quality entire." As such, Lewy wants to see a parallel with ὅλον φῶς in fr. 59 and thus understand the Connectors as the originators of the "entire light" of Aion. (Cf., in this regard, Proclus, *In Tim.*, III, 18, 4-5: ὁ αἰών...ὡς συνοχεὺς καὶ φρουρός.) But in the context of Damascius, ὁλοποιοί must be understood as constructed from ὅλος + ποιέω.

## Fr. 84

Des Places, p. 87, following Kroll and Lewy, had originally cited only the second hemistich of this verse as oracular, but now affirms Tardieu's reconstruction (following Saffrey-Westerink) and would replace it in his text as fr. 23 *bis*. See "Notes," p. 324.

1. **πάντας**: cj. Saffrey-Westerink, *causa metri*; πάντα, codd.

2. **(ὁ πρῶτος συνοχεύς)**: i.e., the Father or Highest God, understood here as the ultimate source of the Connectors. Cf. Julian the Chaldean's prayer to τὸν συνοχέα τοῦ παντός as reported by Psellus, *De aurea catena* (ed. Sathas, *Annuaire...des études grécques*, IX, 1875, p. 217, 2 ff.). Cf., also, συνοχεύς, fr. 207.

3. **ἔξω ὑπάρχει**: Cf. *ibid.*, fr. 1 and notes. See Hadot (*Porphyre*, I, p. 306 and n. 4): "L'Un ou Père représente le moment de la concentration, de l'union, dans lequel préexistent, sous un mode caché, non deployé, seminal, toutes les déterminations ultérieures." This expression thus describes the essentially ineffable nature of the First God before he is even deployed triadically. Hadot, *ibid.*, cites Proclus, *Th. pl.*, 268, 34 (Portus) as a parallel to this idea: ὥδινε μὲν ὁ πρῶτος (πατὴρ) τὴν τῶν ὅλων ἀπογέννησιν. Cf., also, frr. 3, 18, 191 and notes; Lewy, p. 129 and n. 240.

## Fr. 85

1. **ὁ πρῶτος (τελετάρχης)**: The "first Teletarch" is the Ruler of the Empyrean World (identified with the transmundane sun or Aion). See Lewy, p. 149 and n. 305; Saffrey-Westerink, notes *ad loc.*

2. **ταρσὸν τοῦ πυρός**: i.e., the soul. This image reflects Plato, *Phaedrus*, 246. During the *anagōgē*, it was the function of the first Teletarch to conduct the soul upward (probably under the influence of Eros). Cf. fr. 46; Synesius, H. 9(1), 118-119: ...ταρσοῖς/ἀναγωγίων ἐρώτων; 1(3), 617-618: νοεροὺς ταρσούς; 2(4), 285: ταρσὸς ψυχᾶς; 3(5), 67: ψυχᾶς ταρσούς, and *passim*.

3. **ὁ δὲ μέσος...τελειοῖ...τὸν αἰθέρα**: A reference to the Ruler of the Ethereal World (identified with the mundane sun).

**ὁ δὲ τρίτος...τὴν...ὕλην τελειοῖ**: i.e., the Ruler of the Material World (identifed with the moon). Cf., also, Psellus, *Hypotyp.*, 5: προσεχεῖς δὲ τοῖς συνοχεῦσι τοὺς τελετάρχας τιθέασι τρεῖς καὶ αὐτοὺς ὄντας· ὧν ὁ μὲν ἐμπύριος, ὁ δὲ αἰθέριος, ὁ δὲ ὑλάρχης. Proclus locates the Teletarchs at the third and last level of the intelligible-and-intellectual order. See Lewy, Exc. VII, pp. 483-484.

## Fr. 86

2. **ψυχοκράτωρ**: i.e., the second Teletarch or Ruler of the Ethereal World. In the context of Proclus, "soul" is associated, in general, with the Ethereal World, "intellect" (ὁ νοῦς) with the Empyrean World. As the "Ruler of souls," the sun draws the soul upward on its rays. See Lewy, p. 149 and n. 304; Des Places, "Notes," p. 326.

3. **ἐπιβεβηκώς**: Cf. ἐπεμβαίνουσι, fr. 76.

## Fr. 87

**1. αἱ...φῆμαι**: Proclus uses this term exclusively of oracles derived from individual inspiration (such as the *Chaldean Oracles*), in contrast to οἱ χρησμοί, or oracles received at established places such as Delphi. However, Porphyry, Damascius, and others make no such distinction. See Lewy, Exc. I, p. 446 p.

**2. ὄνομα σεμνόν**: Equivalent to the Iynges as *voces mysticae* (and thus equated as well with the συνθήματα/σύμβολα which are "sown" throughout the world; cf. fr. 108). Cf. Proclus, *In Tim.*, I, 274, 16-18: διὸ καὶ τοῖς θεουργοῖς ὀνόματα θεῖα κοσμικὰ παραδέδοται, τὰ μὲν ἄρρητα καλούμενα, τὰ δὲ ῥητὰ παρ' αὐτοῖς. See Lewy, p. 134 and n. 256.

**ἀκοιμήτῳ στροφάλιγγι**: Cf. ἀόκνῳ στροφάλιγγι, fr. 49. This expression conveys the image of the Iynges as moving out from and back towards the Father in a ceaseless, circular motion. Cf., also, στρόφαλον, fr. 206, with reference to Hecate's "magic wheel."

**3. κόσμοις ἐνθρῷσκον**: Cf. κόσμοις ἐνθρῴσκουσαι, fr. 76. It is from the vantage point of the stars (or κόσμοι) that the Iynges communicate their magical names back and forth between the sensible and intelligible worlds.

## Fr. 88

**1. [ἡ φύσις]**: As Kroll suggests, *loc. cit.*, ἡ φύσις is probably introduced here by Psellus from a preceding paragraph. Following Des Places, then, I have bracketed this term. Lewy, however, (p. 263, n. 14), following the parallel of Synesius (see *infra*), prefers to bracket εἶναι.

**τοὺς δαίμονας**: In the Chaldean system, the sublunar world was believed to be inhabited by various demonic powers who pervaded all aspects of Nature. Cf., e.g., frr. 90-92, 216. In addition to demons, there were "orders" (τάξεις) of gods, angels, and probably heroes. Cf., e.g., Psellus, *Hypotyp.*, 20-21: εἰσὶ δὲ θεῖαι τάξεις καὶ γένη περὶ ἕκαστον τῶν στοιχείων· μεθ' οὓς οἱ τῶν θεῶν ὀπαδοὶ ἄγγελοι ἐφ' οἷς αἱ τῶν δαιμόνων ἀγέλαι...καὶ μετὰ τούτους οἱ ἥρωες. Cf. Hadot, *Porphyre*, I, p. 397 and notes 2-4, who suggests that the order of heroes may well have been introduced by Porphyry. But Cremer, p. 39, thinks that the series including heroes is based on a Chaldean *Vorlage*. Cf., also, Festugière, *Rév.*, III, p. 263, who is of the same opinion. Synesius, *H.* 5(2), 52-53, alludes to this verse: ἵνα δαιμόνων ὅμιλον/φύσις ἰζάνοισα τίκτει. See Lewy, p. 263; Geudtner, pp. 59-60.

**2. κακῆς ὕλης**: In the Chaldean system, matter is viewed as an aggressive, evil force and thoroughly demonized, a notion prominent in the Platonic "underworld." However, unlike most of the Gnostic and Hermetic systems, this hylophobia does not extend to the Ethereal World or region of the fixed stars. In this regard, cf. esp. fr. 153 and notes and see discussion in Introduction.

**τὰ...βλαστήματα χρηστὰ καὶ ἐσθλά**: The "offspring" here are evil demons associated with the earth. Cf. the χθόνιοι κύνες of frr. 90 and 91. In the extant fragments, there are no "good" demons per se, although Psellus (*Hypotyp.* 23) mentions such a class. It is likely that these so-called "good" demons (who aid the ascent of the soul) are to be classed with the ministering angels of the Chaldean system. (See Lewy, pp. 260-261 and discussion in Introduction.) In the context of Psellus, this oracular fragment as a whole is directed toward placating

evil demons during the course of a theurgic initiation. Lewy (p. 269 and n. 36) adds that the fragment probably constituted part of a "placatory prayer" aimed at preventing these demons from despoiling the "chief theurgical action of conjuring 'Nature' " (which Lewy identifies with Hecate). But Nature, more properly, should be identified as *deriving* from Hecate. Cf., esp., fr. 54 and notes.

## Fr. 89

**2. θηροπόπλον**: Cf. θῆρες χθονός, fr. 157; χθόνιοι κύνες (and variations), frr. 90, 91, 135; κυνῶν ἀλόγων, fr. 156. Thus, the "beastly" nature of evil demons lures the soul to a similar "animal" life.

**ἀναιδές**: Cf. ἀναιδεῖς, fr. 135 (as descriptive of the χθόνιοι κύνες). In Antiquity, "shameless" was a common description for the nature of dogs. See Lewy, p. 217, n. 41, who notes that the term ἀναίδεια was regularly associated with the Cynics and their self-designated "dog-like" existence.

## Fr. 90

**1-2. κόλπων γαίης**: Cf., esp., χθόνιοι κόλποι, fr. 216. The "hollows of the earth" are the specific location of terrestrial demons. Cf. Psellus, *Hypotyp.* 23, where evil demons are similarly said to be ἐν τῷ κοιλώματι. Lewy (p. 308, n. 186; cf. p. 259, n. 3) sees a possible allusion to the caverns of Tartarus.

**2. θρῴσκουσιν**: Cf. forms of ἐνθρῴσκω, frr. 14, 34, 76, 87; ἐκθρῴσκω, frr. 35, 37, 42.

**χθόνιοι κύνες**: Cf. frr. 91, 135, 156; Synesius, *H.* 1(3), 96-97: ψυχοβόρους κύνας; 2(4), 245-247: σεῦε δ' ἀναιδῆ/κύνα τὸν χθόνιον/δαίμονα γαίας; Proclus, *In rem p.*, II, 337, 17-19: ὃ δὴ καὶ τὰ λόγια "κυσὶν" ἀπεικάζειν εἴωθεν (sc. τὸ δαιμόνιον γένος) καὶ "πηρὸν" ἀποκαλεῖν ὡς νοῦ καὶ διανοίας ἄμοιρον. See Geudtner, pp. 56-63.

**2-3. ἀληθὲς σῆμα**: During the course of the theurgic rites, "true signs" (such as the fiery apparitions described in fr. 146) preceded the arrival of the conjured god or goddess. The danger here—as the fragment warns—is the always present possibility of false or deceptive signs sent by evil demons to subvert the theurgist's "divine work." Cf. Iambl., *De myst.*, III.5: τὰ σημεῖα τῶν ἐπιπνεομένων (i.e., the entranced medium) τὰ θεῖα τεκμήρια τῆς ἀληθινῆς ἐνθουσιάσεως.

**4. τιμωροὺς τῶν ψυχῶν**: This notion of "avenging demons" (which ultimately goes back to the Erinyes of Homer) is a common one, both in terms of post-mortem punishments in Hades as well as vices which afflict the body here and now. Cf., e.g., *C.H.* I.23; XIII.7; *Asclepius*, 28; Lydus, *De mens.*, IV, 32; p. 90, 24-91,9 W.; Iambl., *De myst.*, II.7. See, also, Cremer, pp. 77-78; Nock-Festugière, *Corpus Hermeticum* I, esp. p. 24, n. 57.

## Fr. 91

**1. οἱ ἄλογοι δαίμονες**: Cf. κυνῶν ἀλόγων, fr. 156.

**2. ἐλάτειρα**: A likely reference to Hecate, who is traditionally associated with dogs or hounds. Porphyry (*De philos. ex or. haur.*, p. 151, Wolff) equates the dogs

of Hecate with evil demons. Thus Hecate, as the source of demonic nature (cf. fr. 54) becomes the "driver" or mistress of these demons. See Lewy, p. 271 and n. 41, who thinks this verse formed part of a conjuration hymn.

**ἠερίων...κυνῶν, χθονίων τε καὶ ὑγρῶν**: i.e., demons of the air, earth, and water. Damascius, *loc. cit.*, also mentions demons of the heavens (οὐράνιοι), ether (αἰθέριοι), and Underworld (ὑποχθόνιοι). In this regard, cf. *Orph. Hymn*: ΠΡΟΣ ΜΥΣΑΙΟΝ (ed. Athanassakis), 32-33: Δαίμονας οὐρανίους καὶ ἐνύδρους/καὶ χθονίους καὶ ὑποχθονίους ἠδ' ἐμπυριφοίτους. But see Lewy, p. 268, n. 34, who argues that the classification heaven, ether, water, earth, Underworld originates with Proclus.

## Fr. 92

2. **ὑδροβατῆρας**: Lit. "water-walkers." Cf. the κυνῶν ὑγρῶν of fr. 91. Proclus, *loc. cit.*, also uses the more common ἔνυδρον to describe these demons. In this regard, cf. νύμφαι ἐνύδρια, fr. 216. Festugière (*Tim.*, IV, p. 143 and n. 4) translates this expresssion as "qui se meuvent dans l'eau."

## Fr. 93

2. **πολυχεύμονα**: This term is descriptive of matter. Cf., e.g., ῥεύσωμεν χεῦμα ταπεινόν, fr. 171 and forms of ῥευστός in frr. 128 and 134.

**φῦλα**: i.e., evil demons. See Lewy, p. 260 and n. 4.

## Fr. 94

3. **νοῦν μὲν ψυχῇ**: Here, the World Soul. The *locus classicus* is Plato, *Tim.*, 30 b 4: νοῦν μὲν ἐν ψυχῇ, ψυχὴν δὲ ἐν σώματι συνιστὰς τὸ πᾶν συνετεκταίνετο. See Lewy, p. 182 and n. 24. Hadot, *Porphyre*, I, p. 340, n. 5, sees this passage of Plato's as "the point of departure" for later speculation about the vehicle of the soul.

<ψυχὴν δ'>: cj. Kroll (and so Des Places).

3-4. **ἐνὶ σώματι ἀργῷ ἡμέας ἐγκατέθηκε**: Here (in contrast to Plato), the oracle is describing the particular souls of generation weighed down by the material or "sluggish" body (or, perhaps, more specifically, the vehicle of the soul; cf. e.g., the use of σῶμα in fr. 128). Cf., also, Synesius, *H.* 1(3), 564-568: Σὺ γὰρ ἐν κόσμῳ/κατέθου ψυχάν,/διὰ δὲ ψυχᾶς/ἐν σώματι νοῦν/ἔσπειρας, ἄναξ. See Geudtner, p. 70, n. 302; Theiler, 1942, p. 29 = 1966, p. 287.

4. **πατὴρ ἀνδρῶν τε θεῶν τε**: In the context of Proclus, a reference to the Demiurge, identified with Zeus. Cf. *In Tim.*, I, 408, 23-24: περὶ τοῦ μεγίστου Διὸς τὸ πατὴρ ἀνδρῶν τε θεῶν τε. See, also, Festugière, *Tim.*, II, pp. 176 and n. 1; 282. The Chaldean reference, however, is to the Highest God as *Pater*. Cf., e.g., frr. 25 and 115.

## Fr. 95

1. **τοῦτον χαρακτῆρα**: According to Plato (*Tim.*, 36 b-d), the World Soul had the shape of a Chi (X), the axes of which were bent and joined together to form semi-circles. In Chaldean thought—since particular souls were patterned on the World Soul—they, too, had the same configuration. In the context of Proclus,

knowledge of this "character" had magical significance, permitting the theurgist to invoke the souls of certain heroes (e.g., Heracles, Pentheus) and even Plato himself. In this latter regard, cf. Psellus, *De aur. cat.* (as cited by Lewy, p. 253, n. 96): καὶ ὅτι ('Ιουλιανὸς ὁ Χαλδαῖος) ταύτην (τὴν τοῦ Πλάτωνος ψυχὴν) ἐποπτεύων ἔκ τινος τέχνης ἱερατικῆς ἐπυνθάνετο περὶ ὧν ἐβούλετο. Cf., also, Proclus, *In Tim.*, III, 6, 13-15: διὰ χαρακτήρων καὶ ὀνομάτων ζωτικῶν τελοῦντες τὰ ἀγάλματα καὶ ζῶντα καὶ κινούμενα ἀποτελοῦντες. (See Festugière, *Tim.*, IV, p. 22 and n. 2; cf. *Tim.*, III, 299 and n. 1.) As such, these "characters" and "names" can be equated with the "tokens" and "symbols" of Chaldean terminology as *voces mysticae.*

**2. ἐγκάρδιον**: i.e., the soul. Cf. Iambl., *De myst.*, II.7, where the expression ἐγκαρδιαῖον φῶς refers to the "inner light" of purified souls evoked during an *autoptic* rite. (See Cremer, pp. 97-98.) Cf., also, καρδία, fr. 211; κραδίης, fr. 58 (here, a reference to the sun as the "heart" of the universe).

## Fr. 96

**1. ψυχή, πῦρ...οὖσα φαεινόν**: In the context of Psellus, a reference to the World Soul (and so Lewy, p. 86 and n. 75; cf. p. 87, n. 76). Festugière, however, (*Rév.*, III, p. 58, and thus Des Places, p. 90), understands a reference to the human soul. Cf., in this regard, Kroll, *loc. cit.*; Theiler, 1942, p. 33 = 1966, p. 291 and n. 129. But in either case, both the World Soul and particular souls (as fiery entities) ultimately derive from the Primordial Fire or Father.

**δυνάμει πατρός**: "Power" is regularly associated with the Highest God. Cf. frr. 1, 3, 4, 5, 56, 136.

**2. ζωῆς δεσπότις**: As "Mistress of Life," the World Soul animates the sensible world. Cf., e.g., frr. 32, 54, 56. Kroll, however, *loc. cit.*, understands here the particular soul which animates the body.

**3. ἴσχει**: Cf. *ibid.*, fr. 79.

**πολλῶν πληρώματα κόλπων**: Cf. τὸν ζῳογόνον πληροῦσ' Ἑκάτης κόλπον, fr. 32. In Gnostic sources, pleroma is a *technicus terminus* designating the "fullness" of the Divine world as a whole.

## Fr. 97

**1. θεὸν ἄγξει**: According to Lewy (p. 98 and n. 88), analogous to ἐν θεῷ κεῖνται, fr. 130. (Psellus, *loc. cit.*, paraphrases: τὸ θεῖον...πῦρ ἡ ψυχὴ βιάζεται εἰς ἑαυτήν.) Thus, for Lewy, God—in the absolute sense—refers here to Aion as the ultimate "resting place" of the elevated soul. (See esp. pp. 20, 28, 104.) But fr. 1 suggests that, in addition to this ascent to Aion (= the "light" of the Father; cf. fr. 49), there was a further ascent to the Father himself via some form of genuine contemplative activity (and not just externally manipulated theurgic ritual, as Lewy suggests. See detailed discussion in Introduction.)

**2. οὐδὲν θνητὸν ἔχουσα**: i.e., the soul can now be considered free of all the material defilements associated with corporeality. But whether, as Lewy suggests (e.g., pp. 198-199), this expression refers to the "final purification of the soul" is problematic. It may well allude just to the purification and "salvation" of the lower soul/ὄχημα-πνεῦμα (see fr. 129 and notes) in preparation for the contemplative purging of the higher or rational soul.

**μεμέθυσται**: i.e., the "drunkenness" of "sober intoxication," a common expression to describe ecstatic experience. (Psellus, *loc. cit.*, paraphrases: ἐξίσταται ἑαυτῆς.) Cf., e.g., Philo, *De opif.*, 71: μέθῃ νηφαλίῳ κατασχεθείς (sc. ὁ νοῦς). But note that here, ὁ νοῦς is seized by "sober intoxication" when it perceives the Forms or Ideas; beyond this point, according to Philo, there is a further ascent to "the Great King Himself." In the *Oracles*, it may well be that the ascent to Aion similarly permitted perception of the Ideas (cf. fr. 49) in a moment of "sober intoxication," prior to the ascent to the Father. (Cf. Plotinus, *Enn.* VI.7.35 where, similarly, prior to the ascent to the One, the elevated soul experiences itself as "nous in love," this state described by Plotinus as one of divine "drunkenness".)

*3.* **ἁρμονίαν**: i.e., the cosmic harmony of the Ethereal World dominated by Apollo-Helios (cf. fr. 71). Lewy (p. 200, n. 102) suggests that the "paean" mentioned in fr. 131 may have been a hymn in which the soul exalted her "union with the harmony of the universe." Cf., also, *C.H.* I.25 re the ascent of the soul διὰ τῆς ἁρμονίας.

## Fr. 98

Tardieu (Lewy$^2$, p. 680) considers this fragment "dubious." (It is cited neither by Kroll nor Lewy.) Bieler, however, (Boethius, *loc. cit.*, *ad not.*), suggests a possible Chaldean origin: "hexameter alios ignotus ex oraculo quodam Chaldaico fortasse sumptus est." Des Places (p. 139) thinks the "sense" of the fragment is close to that of frr. 94 and 130.

*2.* **ἀνδρὸς ἱεροῦ δέμας**: Cf. δέμας, frr. 163 and 224. Des Places thinks the use of this term further affirms a possible Chaldean origin for this fragment (despite Tardieu's objection). See "Notes," p. 326.

**αἰθέρες**: Perhaps an allusion to the ethereal raiments which make up the vehicle of the soul. Cf. fr. 62 and notes.

## Fr. 99

**1-2. (τὴν γένεσιν) θητεύειν**: Cf. σώματι θητεύσασα, fr. 110; Synesius, *De insomn.*, 139 c: θῆσσα γὰρ κατιοῦσα τὸν πρῶτον βίον ἐθελοντὴς ἀντὶ τοῦ θητεῦσαι δουλεύει (sc. ἡ ψυχή); *H.* 1(3), 571-574: κατέβαν ἀπὸ σοῦ/χθονὶ θητεῦσαι,/ἀντὶ δὲ θήσσας/γενόμαν δούλα. This "service" and "enslavement" properly constitute two phases in the descent of the soul. See, e.g., Theiler, 1942, p. 32 = 1966, p. 291; Cremer, p. 91 ff.; Geudtner, pp. 27-29; Hadot, *Porphyre*, I, p. 186 and n. 2; Lewy, p. 189 and n. 45.

**2-3. ἀδαμάστῳ τωὐχένι**: The soul which serves generation with an "untamed neck" does not yield to the temptations of material existence, i.e., it does not become enslaved by matter. Its reward is an immediate return to its Divine home after death. See Lewy, p. 189 and n. 45.

## Fr. 100

**2. αὐχμηράν**: Lewy (p. 297, n. 143, following the gloss of Proclus) translates this term as "arid." Cf. Festugière, *Rép.*, III, p. 101, n. 2: "αὐχμηρός = evidément 'qui a perdu sa fraîcheur, son éclat, qui est ternie, desséchée,' comme une femme stérile." Des Places, however (p. 91), prefers a more ambiguous "sale," noting that matter properly contains a humid element.

## Fr. 101

**1. φύσεως...αὔτοπτον ἄγαλμα**: In the context of Psellus, it is a matter of apparitions, in general, evoked during the theurgic rites. Cf., in this regard, αὐτόπτοις, fr. 142; Iambl., *De myst.*, II.4: αὐτοφανῶν ἀγαλμάτων; II.10: αὐτοπτικὰ ἀγάλματα. See Cremer, pp. 45; 143-144. But the original Chaldean context may well have been a specific reference to Hecate, who is connected both with Nature and the moon. Cf., e.g., Proclus, *In rem p.*, II, 133, 1-18: εἰς τὴν σεληνιακὴν...σφαῖραν, ἐν ᾗ τῆς γενέσεως αἰτίαι πάσης καὶ, ὡς φησίν τις ἱερὸς λόγος, τὸ "αὔτοπτον ἄγαλμα τῆς φύσεως" προσλάμπει; *In Tim.*, III, 69, 15-16: σελήνη μὲν αἰτία τοῖς θνητοῖς τῆς φύσεως, τὸ "αὔτοπτον ἄγαλμα" οὖσα τῆς πηγαίας φύσεως. Lewy (pp. 98, n. 134; 271) connects this fragment with frr. 102-103 and 107 as interdictions against invoking Hecate "face to face," in order to avoid attacks of demons (which Hecate controls; cf. fr. 91). Cf., also, Festugière, *Rép.*, III, p. 77, n. 6; *Tim.*, IV, p. 94 and n. 5.

## Fr. 102

**1. ἡ γὰρ τῆς φύσεως πηγή**: An allusion to Hecate as the "source" of material generation or "Nature." Cf., esp., the role of Hecate in frr. 51-54.

**2. φύσιν/εἱμαρμένον**: Here, "Nature" and "Destiny" are equated. Cf. Proclus, *In Tim.*, III, 271, 16-17: ἐμβλέψασαι (αἱ ψυχαί) εἰς...τὴν φύσιν ἑαυτὰς εἱμαρμένῃ συντάττουσιν; Synesius, *H.* 1(3), 603-608: ἵνα χεῖρα φύσις/οὐκ ἐπιβάλλει,/ὅθεν οὐκέτι γᾶ,/οὐ μοιραία/κλῶσις ἀνάγκας/παλίνορσον ἄγει. See Theiler, 1942, pp. 33-34 = 1966, p. 291. In the context of the theurgic rites, "gazing" (ἐμβλέψῃς) at "Nature/Destiny" (or Hecate) is to invite the danger of demonic attack. Cf. fr. 101 and notes; εἱμαρμένον, fr. 103; εἱμαρτῆς, fr. 130; εἱμαρτήν, fr. 153. See, also, Lewy, p. 98, n. 134.

## Fr. 103

**1. συναυξήσῃς**: Cf. Proclus, *De prov.*, 164, 8: "neque coaugeas fatum, cuius finis..." Kroll (p. 50, n. 1) reconstructs the Greek as: μηδὲ συναυξήσῃς τὸ πεπρωμένον, οὗ τέλος <οὐδέν>. See, also, Lewy, p. 266, n. 23, who conjectures Ἄιδης as the missing predicate noun.

**εἱμαρμένον**: cj. Des Places (cf. fr. 102); τὴν εἱμαρμένην, codd. Thus, the oracle admonishes "not to increase" or "add to" the influence of demonic Destiny which infects all aspects of material creation or φύσις.

## Fr. 104

**1. μὴ πνεῦμα μολύνῃς**: According to Westerink (*Greek Comm. Phaedo,* II, *Damascius* p. 193, note), only these three words belong to the *Oracles* and should come after fr. 105 with the following reconstruction: ζηλόν τε φθόνον τε/ἔχβαλε, μηδὲ φρενὶ σβέσσαι, μὴ πνεῦμα μολύνῃς. Westerink argues that Psellus "may unwittingly have added some extraneous material to the *Oracles*, as he did in other cases." Des Places, however, notes that Proclus elsewhere attests to the second half of the verse (e.g., *In rem p.*, II, 52, 5) as does Hermias (*In Phaedrum,* p. 130, 28 ff.), and would thus keep the verse as is. See, "Notes," p. 327 and *testimonia* to fr. 104, p. 92. In the context of the *Oracles*, πνεῦμα is synonymous with ὄχημα as a term for the "vehicle" of the soul. The ὄχημα-πνεῦμα, then, would be com-

prised of quasi-material accretions from the ether, sun, moon, and air. (Cf. fr. 61. See, also, frr. 120, 128, 129, 158, 201 and notes.) The oracle warns against "defiling" or "soiling" the vehicle; i.e., becoming totally immersed in matter (and thus subject to demonic temptation). This Chaldean expression is also familiar to Synesius: e.g., *H.* 1(3), 56: πνεῦμα μολύνει; 547-548: καὶ πνεῦμα σάου/ἀμόλυντον, ἄναξ; *De insomn.*, 151 d: ἡ μὲν (sc. ψυχή) ἧττον, ἡ δὲ μᾶλλον, ὡς ἑκάστη ῥοπῆς ἐδυστύχησε τὸ πνεῦμα ἐμόλυνεν. See Geudtner, pp. 13-15; Theiler, 1942, p. 37 = 1966, p. 297; Hadot, *Porphyre*, I, p. 187, n. 3; Lewy, p. 184 and n. 29.

**1-2. μηδὲ βαθύνῃς/τοὐπίπεδον**: cj. Kroll (and thus Lewy and Des Places) to fit the meter; τὸ ἐπίπεδον, codd. Kroll's reconstruction is rejected by Westerink, *ibid.*, who argues that the sentence is not a verse but only has the "look" of a hexameter and that it is μολύνῃς which properly ends the line (see preceding note). As for the terminology, ἐπίπεδον is a geometric term borrowed from Pythagorean speculation. In Lewy's words: "The...fragment...is explicable on the ground of the Pythagorean interpretation of the plane as the number three...The number three is in the Oracles the measure of the noetic and therefore the purport of the oracular warning is that the mortal should not 'materialize' his mental substance by extension into the realm of the somatic" (see p. 396 and notes 311-313). Cf. Proclus, *In rem p.*, II, 52, 5 and *In Tim.*, I, 146, 14-15, where ἐπίπεδον is equated with material creation. Psellus, however, understands this term as referring to the "luminous garment" (αὐγοειδῆ χιτῶν) of the soul as distinct from the πνεῦμα. But this subtlety is a Neoplatonic, not Chaldean, distinction. See, e.g., I. Hadot, *Le Problème du Néoplatonisme Alexandrin,* pp. 99-106.

## Fr. 105

**3. φρενὶ μὴ σβέσαι**: Lewy (p. 265, n. 18) suggests as objects either τὸν ἁγνὸν ἔρωτα, τὸν ψυχαῖον σπινθῆρα (cf. fr. 44), or τὸ ψυχῆς ὄμμα (cf. fr. 112). Cf., also, fr. 45, where the descent to matter is said to "stifle" the "true love" of the Divine. Kroll, *loc. cit.*, compares this fragment to the series of injunctions enumerated by Proclus in *De prov.*, 175 (144, 16-18 B.): "Te ipsum videns, verere! et, iterum: Cognosce te ipsum! iam institit, et in aliis: Extra corpus esse te ipsum crede, et es!" Kroll believes this last injunction is drawn from the *Oracles*. Cf. comments of Westerink in notes to fr. 104, *supra.*

## Fr. 106

**1. τολμηρᾶς**: In the context of Psellus, man is "impudent" because he deigns to comprehend the workings of Nature. (Cf. fr. 107; Lewy, p. 254, n. 98.) Lewy (p. 55, n. 175) suggests that the admonition was preceded by σιγά (as in fr. 132). In Gnostic and Hermetic sources (as well as Numenius and some early passages of Plotinus), τόλμα generally describes the soul's descent into matter as an ambitious act of self-will. But as Dodds has shown, the later Plotinus, in reaction to Gnostic thinking, views the soul's direct descent as an inner necessity, free of deliberate willfulness. See Dodds, *Pagan and Christian*, pp. 23-26; Festugière, *Rév.*, III, p. 83 ff.; Zandee, *Terminology,* pp. 26-28.

## Fr. 107

The oracle enumerates various types of divination, all of which are to be rejected in favor of theurgy. In Lewy's words (p. 257): "As Iamblichus contends (e.g., *De myst.*, III. 27-28; 31) theurgy is the only legitimate form of divination, as it is bound up with the apprehension of the noetic powers which are the real rulers of the Universe."

**2. ἀληθείης**: "Truth" is associated with the sun. See Lewy, p. 146 and n. 293; cf. p. 49, n. 158, where Lewy cites examples of Apollo's (= the sun's) association with "truth."

**3. μέτρον ἠελίου κανόνας συναθροίσας**: Cf. Proclus, *In Tim.*, I, 202, 17: μετρῶν δρόμον ἡελίου κανόνας συναθροίσας. Festugière, *Tim.*, I, p. 261, n. 1, understands κανόνας as referring specifically to astronomical or chronological "tables."

**4. ἀϊδίῳ βουλῇ πατρός**: Cf. ἀκμάδι βουλῇ (of the Father), fr. 37; βουλαῖς ἀφθέγκτοις (of the Father), fr. 77; πατρὸς πειθηνίδι βουλῇ, fr. 81. Cf., also, <πρωτίστου πατρὸς> ἀϊδίου νῷ, fr. 22.

**5. ῥοῖζον**: Cf., esp., ῥοή, fr. 56 and notes, for parallels.

**6. ἀστέριον προπόρευμα**: Cf. *ibid.*, fr. 64. The entire verse is cited verbatim by Proclus, *In Tim.*, III, 124, 31 in conjunction with fr. 64.

**8. οὐ θυσιῶν σπλάγχνων κτλ.**: Cf. Synesius, *De insomn.*, 135 c, who cites this verse verbatim as a λόγιον.

**9. φεῦγε**: Common to the *Oracles*. Cf. frr. 130, 134, 213.

**10. εὐσεβίης ἱερὸν παράδεισον**: A reference to the Chaldean abode of the blessed. Cf., esp., παράδεισον, fr. 165 and notes.

**11. ἀρετή**: "Virtue" is an appellation of the moon. Cf. ἀρετῆς, fr. 52; Lewy, p. 221 and n. 181.

**σοφία**: "Wisdom" is associated with the planet Mercury. See Lewy, p. 221 and notes 183 and 184.

**εὐνομία**: "Good order" is an attribute of the fixed stars. See Lewy, p. 221 and n. 182.

## Fr. 108

**2. σύμβολα**: These "symbols" are equivalent to the "tokens" (συνθήματα; cf. frr. 2, 109) as *voces mysticae*. This expression also designates the sacred *materia* (e.g., stones, herbs, scents) handled by the theurgist during some of the Chaldean rites. In this regard, cf. Psellus, *P.G.*, 122, 1132 a; Proclus, *De Magia*, p. 151, 10 ff.; Bidez. For further details, see discussion in Introduction.

**πατρικὸς νόος**: Here, the Father or Highest God. Cf. *ibid.*, fr. 39; πατρικὸς νοῦς, fr. 109.

**ἔσπειρεν κατὰ κόσμον**: "Sown in the cosmos," the *symbola* can be equated with the Platonic Forms (and thus with the Iynges; cf. frr. 76-78). In addition, these "symbols" are also said to be "sown in the soul" (as *voces mysticae*). Cf. Proclus, *In Tim.*, I, 211, 1-2: συμβόλοις ἀρρήτοις τῶν θεῶν, ἃ τῶν ψυχῶν ὁ πατὴρ ἐνέσπειρεν αὐταῖς; Psellus, *P.G.*, 122, 1141 a: Σύμβολα πατρικὸς νόος ἔσπειρε ταῖς ψυχαῖς. See Festugière, *Tim.*, II, p. 32, n. 1. Cf., also, ἔσπαρται, fr. 28; ἐνέσπειρεν, fr. 39 and notes.

**3. τὰ νοητά**: The "intelligibles" are the Ideas. Cf. *ibid.*, frr. 8, 31, 40.

**κάλλη ἄφραστα**: Descriptive of the Ideas. Cf., e.g., Philo, *De Opif.*, 71: τὰς ἰδέας θεασάμενος, ὑπερβάλλοντα κάλλη. See Lewy, p. 191 and n. 55. The vocabulary goes back to Plato, e.g., *Phaedrus*, 250 b-d.

## Fr. 109

**1. τὸ θέλειν**: Cf. τὸ θέλειν κατένευσε, fr. 22 (but here, as an act of the Father); Cremer, p. 98 and n. 506.

**πατρικὸς νοῦς**: Cf. frr. 39 and 108.

**2. λήθης**: i.e., the "forgetfulness" of the soul after it has "fallen" into the body. Cf. ἐκ λήθης, fr. 171. The image is common, going back to Plato, e.g., *Phaedrus*, 248 c; 250 a. See Lewy, p. 190 and n. 53 for numerous parallels in a variety of sources.

**ῥῆμα**: Analogous to the συνθήματα/σύμβολα as well as to the ἱερῷ λόγῳ of fr. 110. Cf. Psellus' commentary, *loc. cit.*: συνέστη γὰρ ἡ ψυχὴ ἀπὸ τῶν ἱερῶν λόγων καὶ τῶν θείων συμβόλων.

**3. πατρικοῦ συνθήματος ἀγνοῦ**: Cf., esp., τριάδος σύνθημα, fr. 2, as a possible allusion to the triadic nature of the Highest God. "Remembering" or "focusing" on this token ( = ἄνθος νοῦ? cf. notes to fr. 110) serves as an anagogic device to prod the soul upward. See further discussion in Introduction.

## Fr. 110

**1. ψυχῆς ὀχετόν**: i.e., the "channel" or solar "ray" on which the soul both descends into the body and then ascends on high during the theurgic rites. Cf., esp., ἐμπυρίοις ὀχετοῖς, fr. 2; ὀχετῶν, fr. 66. This term is also analogous to both ἀκτῖνας, fr. 34 and αὐγάς, fr. 115. Cf. Lewy, p. 189 and n. 45.

**1-2. ἔν τινι τάξει/ἐπὶ τάξιν**: For the later Neoplatonists, the term τάξις is used interchangably with σειρά (cf. fr. 203; Bidez, *C.M.A.G.*, IV, 1928, p. 144 and n. 1; Dodds, *Proclus: El. Th.*, pp. 208-209). Lewy (p. 190, n. 47) sees these two prepositional phrases as referring, respectively, to the initial descent of the soul via the ether, sun, moon, and air (cf. fr. 61) and to the Ethereal order where the soul desires to return. In this latter sense, Lewy (*ibid.*) understands μερίς in fr. 158 as referring to the τάξις where the soul ascends. See, also, Geudtner, p. 73 and n. 316; Tardieu, "Oracles chaldaïques," pp. 200-201. Cf., also, *Disc. 8-9*, NHC VI, 52,7-8, where τάξις refers to the "order" of the tradition, understood here as the proper "order" of ascent through the eighth and ninth spheres, or highest levels of spiritual attainment.

**2. σώματι θητεύσασα**: Cf. (τὴν γένεσιν) θητεύειν, fr. 99 and notes.

**<ὑπέβη καὶ πῶς>**: cj. Lewy, p. 189, n. 45, based on Psellus' paraphrase.

**3. αὖθις**: In Tardieu's view ("Oracles chaldaïques," pp. 203-204), this term (analogous to πάλιν) underscores the "renewal," "rebirth," and "regeneration" of the soul.

**ἱερῷ λόγῳ**: Psellus (*loc. cit.*) equates this term with the ἄνθος νοῦ as ἡ ὑψηλοτέρα δύναμις τῆς ψυχῆς. If this equation is valid, then the function of the ἄνθος νοῦ (as a "sacred word" or *synthēma*; cf. ὄνομα σεμνόν, fr. 87) must, in some sense, be theurgic (and not solely contemplative, as suggested in fr. 1). See detailed discussion in Introduction.

**ἔργον**: i.e., the sacred activity of the theurgist. Cf. ἔργα, frr. 66 and 133. Psellus (*loc. cit.*) specifically understands here the material rites (τῶν ὑλικῶν τελετῶν) aimed at purifying the vehicle of the soul: οἴεται γὰρ καθαίρεσθαι τὴν ψυχὴν λίθοις καὶ πόαις καὶ ἐπῳδαῖς, καὶ εὔτροχον εἶναι πρὸς τὴν ἀνάβασιν. Thus, it is both "word" and "action" which prods the soul upward. Cf., in this regard, Iambl., *De myst.*, II.11: ἡ τῶν ἔργων τῶν ἀρρήτων καὶ ὑπὲρ πάσαν νόησιν θεοπρεπῶς

ἐνεργουμένων τελεσιουργία ἥ τε τῶν νοούμενων τοῖς θεοῖς μόνον συμβόλων ἀφθέγκτων δύναμις ἐντίθησιν τὴν θεουργικὴν ἕνωσιν.

**4. παρήχθη**: Tardieu ("Oracles chaldaïques," p. 201) suggests that this term properly conveys the sense of "de-rangement" (παράνοια) or "de-viation" (παρέκβασις) as found frequently in various Gnostic sources with regard to the "fall" of the soul. Cf. Des Places, "Notes," p. 327, who continues to prefer his translation of "a été produite," *contra* Tardieu.

**5. ἀναστησάμενος**: cj. Tardieu (*ibid.*) as a probable gloss on the part of Psellus. But Des Places, "Notes," p. 327, still prefers the reading ἄνευ κρίσεως as attested in *Vaticani graeci*, V, 1026, f° 227 v° and v, 573, f° 96 v°. Migne reads (mistakenly?) ἀναχτησάμενος.

**διὰ τῶν τελεστικῶν ἔργων**: i.e., the various material rites of a theurgic initiation. See, esp., Lewy, Exc. X, pp. 495-496.

## Fr. 111

**1. εὔτροχον δὲ τὸ νοερὸν**: In the context of Proclus, the "intellectual faculty" of the soul is "well-wheeled" in terms of its ability to "revolve" around the Intelligible through various "perfective" means of intellection. Psellus, on the other hand, uses the expression εὔτροχον in connection with the vehicle of the soul and its ascent (see *supra,* notes to ἔργον, fr. 110).

**2. κέντρῳ ἐπισπέρχων**: An allusion to the sun as the "center" (cf. κέντρον, fr. 70) or "heart" (cf. κραδίης, fr. 58) of the planetary spheres and, thus, the "center" of the *anagōgē* as well. In Tardieu's words, the sun functions as a "veritable ἀναγωγεύς." See "Oracles chaldaïques," p. 204, where Tardieu compares *Gos. Truth*, NHC I, 45,36-39 (although here, the solar imagery is applied to Christ). Cf., also, fr. 174 re the "seven-rayed god." The literary model, however, is *Il.* 23, 429 ff.: Ἀντίλοχος δ' ἔτι καὶ πολὺ μᾶλλον ἔλαυνε κέντρῳ ἐπισπέρχων. See Festugière, *Tim.*, III, p. 358, n. 2; Lewy, p. 195 and n. 75, who equates ἐπισπέρχων with ἐπιφοιτᾶν στιβαρηδόν, fr. 2; Theiler, 1942, p. 20, n. 6 = 1966, p. 276, n. 87.

**φωτὸς κελάδοντος**: Here, a reference to the sun. But cf. *ibid.*, fr. 2, where this expression apparently refers to the "rushing" sound of the celestial spheres.

## Fr. 112

**1. ψυχῆς βάθος ἄμβροτον**: Equivalent to the "eye of the soul." See Lewy, p. 169 and n. 388; cf. ὄμμα ψυχῆς, frr. 1; 213. Psellus, however, *loc. cit.*, understands this expression as referring to the "triple powers" or "faculties" of the soul; i.e., αἱ νοεραί, αἱ διανοητικαί, αἱ δοξαστικαί. Psellus' explanation derives from Proclus. Cf. *Exc. chald.*, III; p. 193, 1 Pitra, where ψυχῆς βάθος is similarly interpreted in terms of these three faculties.

**ὄμματα πάντα**: Again, an allusion to the "eye of the soul." According to Lewy, the hyperbolic πάντα (in an anagogic context), "is intended...to hinder the formation of any concrete association" (see pp. 373-374 and notes 235-239, where Lewy cites numerous parallels to this "eye of the soul" expression in a variety of sources). Cf., also, fr. 1, where the ἄνθος/φλὸξ νοῦ terminology similarly alludes to an immediate, intuitive apprehension of the Divine, free of concrete images. In Psellus' interpretation, ὄμματα refers to the γνωστικαὶ ἐνέργειαι of the three soul faculties cited *supra*. Psellus goes on to say that the "eye" is the σύμβολον γνώσεως.

**2. ἐκπέτασον ἄνω**: Analogous to ἐκτείνας νοῦν, fr. 128; cf. τεῖναι κενεὸν νόον, fr. 1. See Lewy, p. 170. The metaphor is also found, e.g., in *C.H.* X.5: ἀναπετάσαι ἡμῶν τοὺς τοῦ ὀφθαλμούς; Philo, *De Plant.*, 58: τῷ διανοίας ὄμματι...ἀεὶ ἀναπεπταμένῳ καὶ εὐθυτενῶς βλέποντι. For Psellus, the faculties of the soul are "stretched" towards Christ.

## Fr. 113

**2. χρὴ δὲ χαλινῶσαι ψυχήν**: i.e., to keep the passions in check. Cf. σώματος...μέγα βρίθοντα χαλινά, fr. 213.

**3. ὄφρα μὴ ἐγκύρσῃ χθονὶ δυσμόρῳ**: Cf. Synesius, *De insomn.*, 140 c: μέχρις ἐγκύρσῃ τῷ μελαναυγεῖ (cf. μελαναυγέα, fr. 163) καὶ ἀμφικνεφεῖ (cf. ἀμφικνεφής, fr 163) χωρῷ; *H.* 1(3), 660-661: μέχρις ἐγκύρσῃ (sc. ἡ ψυχή)/φθονερᾷ μερίδι. The fragment refers to the soul's entrapment in matter. Lewy (p. 172, n. 402, following Lydus), cites Plato, *Phaedo*, 81 c as the *locus classicus*; Geudtner (p. 13, n. 59, following Wuensch), prefers *Phaedrus*, 253 ff.

**σαωθῇ**: Cf. σῶμα σαώσεις, fr. 128.

## Fr. 114

**2. βαπτισθεῖσα**: The image is common. Cf., e.g., *C.H.* XII.2: σώματος γὰρ συνθέτου ὥσπερ χυμοὶ ζέουσιν ἥ τε λύπη καὶ ἡ ἡδονή, εἰς ἃς ἐμβᾶσα ἡ ψυχὴ βαπτίζεται; Synesius, *Dio*, 6, 1129 B: τὸ ἐν λόγοις κάλλος...οὐ βαθύνεται πρὸς ὕλην οὐδὲ ἐμβαπτίζει τὸν νοῦν ταῖς ἐσχάταις δυνάμεσι. See, also, Lewy, p. 277 and notes 76-77 for additional parallels; Hadot, *Porphyre*, I, p. 404 and n. 2.

**χθονὸς οἴστροις**: Analogous to χθονίων παθέων, fr. 213.

## Fr. 115

**1. χρὴ σε σπεύδειν πρὸς τὸ φάος κτλ.**: Cf. Iambl., *De myst.*, II.6: τοὺς ἐπὶ τὸ πῦρ σπεύδοντας; Synesius, *H.* 1(3), 687: ἐς τὸν ἀκηδῆ/λειμῶνα (cf. παράδεισον, fr. 165) πατρὸς/σπεύδω...; M. Victorinus, *H.* II. 46: "Propero, si iubes redire, nostri salvator, deus." Cf., also, **ὅεπη**, *Ap. Jas.*, NHC I, 7,10-12; 37-38; *Tri. Trac.*, NHC I, 123,5-11, and the famous Valentinian Gnostic formula—ποῦ σπεύδομεν—*Exc. Theod.* 70.2. The theme of "haste" to the Divine world is a constant in the religious traditions of this period and parallels the theme of "flight." Cf. forms of φεύγειν, in frr. 107, 130, 134, 213. The *locus classicus* is Plato, *Theat.*, 176 a-b: χρὴ...φεύγειν ὅτι τάχιστα. See, also, Lewy, p. 171 and n. 396; Cremer, p. 80; Geudtner, p. 71; Hadot, *Marius Victorinus*, II, p. 1074; Tardieu, "Oracles chaldaïques," p. 203.

**σπεύδειν**: Cf. *ibid.*, fr. 134; σπεύδοντα, fr. 6; σπεύδουσι, fr. 116.

**φάος**: Cf. forms of φῶς, *passim*.

**αὐγάς**: Cf. *ibid.*, fr. 213; αὐγῆς, fr. 35. Festugière, *Rév.*, III, p. 59, n. 1 suggests αὐλάς; similarly, Theiler, 1942, p. 35 = 1966, p. 294. Cf. αὐλή, fr. 202.

**2. πολὺν ἐσσαμένη νοῦν**: According to Lewy (p. 180 and n. 14; cf. p. 171, n. 396), "Intellect" is the "first constituent of the soul," followed by "Will," and "Eros," which are contained in νοῦς. Cf., esp., frr. 44 and 94. As for πολύν, Des Places translates "multiple;" Festugière (*Rév.*, III, p. 59), "puissant." Griffiths (*CR*, 25, 1975, pp. 241-242, following Merkelbach), would subsititute τορόν for πολύν. Although this reading is plausible, forms of τορός are not attested elsewhere in the extant fragments, whereas forms of πολύς are frequent. Cf., also, ἐσσάμενον, fr. 2; ἐσσάμενος, fr. 42.

## Fr. 116

1. βροτοῖς τοῖς σῶμα νοοῦσιν: i.e., those who think in terms of sensible rather than intelligible realities. Lewy (p. 278, n. 80; cf. pp. 170-171 and n. 395) identifies the σῶμα νοοῦντες with the φιλοσώματοι of Plato, *Phaedo*, 68 c, who are "incapable" of φρονεῖν ἀθάντα καὶ θεῖα (cf. *Tim.*, 90 c).

2. γυμνῆτες: The "naked" soul is one that is free of its material accretions (or vehicle). The image is common. Cf., e.g., Proclus, *In Alc.*, 63 [138,18 Cr.] W.; 83 [180,2 Cr.] W.; Plotinus, *Enn.* I.6.7.7; *C.H.* I.26; X.17; XIII.6; *Pr. Paul*, NHC I, 14,35-36; *Ap. Jas.*, NHC I, 20,30-32: ⲃⲱⲱ or ⲕⲁⲁⲕ ⲁⲣⲏⲟⲩ. For a general discussion, see Rist, *Plotinus*, pp. 188-198.

ἄνω σπεύδουσι πρὸς ὕψος: Cf., esp., fr. 115, v. 1.

## Fr. 117

3. σωζόμεναι δι' ἐῆς ἀλκῆς: Here, "strength" refers to the divine "soul spark" or "flower/flame of mind" which has the power of theurgically uniting the soul to God and thus effecting its "salvation." In the context of Proclus, only certain exceptional individuals can be "saved" via this divine ἀλκή (cf., similarly, fr. 118). In terms of the Chaldean tradition, these "more vigorous natures" (to borrow Proclus' phrase) would be the class of θεουργοί. Cf. Proclus, *In rem p.*, II, 120, 3-4: δηλοῦν ἡμεῖς γε φήσομεν τὴν δι' ἐῆς ἀλκῆς εἰς θεοὺς ἀνάτασιν τῆς τοιαύτης ψυχῆς; *ibid.*, 112, 21-25: καὶ ψυχὴν ἔχων σώματος ὑπερορῶσαν καὶ πρὸς τὸ ἄνω βλέπειν ἐπιτηδείαν καὶ δι' ἧς ἀλκῆς, κατὰ τὸ λόγιον, χωριζομένην ἀπὸ τῶν ὑλικῶν ὀργάνων καὶ εἰς τὸ ἄναντες εὐθὺ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ χωροῦσαν. See Lewy, p. 194 and n. 67: "In these passages, ἀλκή means the noetic power of the soul delivered from matter."

## Fr. 118

2. σπέρμα: Cf. Synesius, *H.* 1(3), 559-561: Σὸν σπέρμα φέρω/... σπινθῆρα νόου; 580-581: οὔπω πᾶσαν/ἔσβεσεν ἀλκάν; 597-598: σπέρμα.../αὔξων ἐν ἐμῷ; *De insomn.*, 138 c: τὸ νοερὸν ἐν ἡμῖν σπέρμα. This "intellectual seed," "strength," or "spark," then, is that divine element within, which is freed once the vehicle of the soul is purified. It is this element (= the ἄνθος/φλὸξ νοῦ; ὄμμα ψυχῆς) which has the power to elevate the soul as well as ultimately unite or "bind" it to God. See, esp., Hadot, *Porphyre*, I, p. 183, n. 4; Geudtner, pp. 50-53.

3. φάους γνώρισμα: According to Geudtner (p. 52), this expression is equivalent to the συνθήματα/σύμβολα. Lewy, however (p. 242 and n. 56), equates it with σημεῖα; i.e., those "signs" which precede the apparition of a deity during the theurgic rites. Cf. ἀληθὲς σῆμα, fr. 90 and notes; Iambl., *De myst.*, II.3: γνωρίσματα θεῶν καὶ δαιμόνων; III.2: τὰ ἀληθινὰ γνωρίσματα (here, as with Synesius, in connection with dream divination).

4. ἐῆς ἀλκῆς: Cf., esp., δι' ἐῆς ἀλκῆς, fr. 117 and notes.

## Fr. 119

1. τοῦ αὐγοειδοῦς σώματος: i.e., the "vehicle" of the soul. See fr. 120 and notes. Although both Hierocles and Psellus (e.g., *P.G.*, 122, 1137 c; see fr. 104 and notes) distinguish between a "luminous" and "pneumatic" vehicle of the soul, this distinction is Neoplatonic, not Chaldean, in origin. See Dodds, *Pro-*

*clus: El. Th.*, p. 320. See, also, Iambl., *De myst.*, III.11; 14; V.26, where the terms αὐγοειδοῦς and αἰθερῶδες are used in connection with both πνεῦμα and ὄχημα, but without the precision of Proclus. See Cremer, pp. 136-139.

τῆς τῶν ὑλικῶν μολυσμῶν: Cf. fr. 104: μὴ πνεῦμα μολύνῃς.

2. τῶν ἱερῶν καθαρμῶν: The vehicle of the soul is purified via various "material" rites. Cf., e.g., Psellus, *P.G.*, 122, 1132 a: ὁ δὲ Χαλδαῖος οὐκ ἄλλως φησὶν ἡμᾶς ἀνάγεσθαι πρὸς θεόν, εἰ μὴ δυναμώσομεν τὸ τῆς ψυχῆς ὄχημα διὰ τῶν ὑλικῶν τελετῶν. See discussion in Introduction.

4. θεοσυνδέτου ἀλκῆς: Hierocles, *loc. cit.*, equates this expression with λύσις ψυχῆς. (See Lewy, p. 194 and n. 66.) Both expressions allude to the unfettered "soul spark" free of its vehicle. Once this stage of the ascent is achieved, the soul's "strength," "spark," "flower/flame of mind" can theurgically unite (or "bind") with God. Cf., similarly, frr. 117 and 118 and discussion in Introduction.

## Fr. 120

2. ψυχῆς λεπτὸν ὄχημα: i.e., the quasi-material "vehicle" of the soul made up of accretions from the ether, sun, moon, and air (see fr. 61). Although Lewy (p. 178, n. 7) accepts this fragment as genuine, he notes that Kroll (p. 47) doubted the existence of an authentic Chaldean text containing the word ὄχημα. But the use of this term (plus the doctrine associated with it) can be confidently assumed for the Chaldean tradition. See discussion in Introduction and cf. frr. 104, 128, 129, 158, 210 and notes.

## Fr. 121

1 + 2. ἡ ἐμπέλασις/ἐμπελάσας: In the context of Proclus, "approaching" is the fourth degree of prayer and precedes the fifth and final degree of ἕνωσις ("union"). The first three degrees are γνῶσις ("knowledge"), οἰκείωσις ("attraction"), and συναφή ("contact"). These five degrees are part of the ascent process and are based on a similar doctrine in Iambl., *De myst.*, V. 26, where three degrees of prayer are mentioned; i.e., συναγωγόν, συνδετικόν (cf. θεοσυνδέτου, fr. 119), and ἡ ἄρρητος ἕνωσις. Dillon (*Iamblichi Fragmenta*, p. 411, n. 1) suggests that Iamblichus' theory of prayer may have had a Chaldean origin, but admits the impossibility of "secure evidence on this point." See, also, Lewy, pp. 173-174 and n. 406; Bremond, "Un Texte de Proclus," pp. 448-462.

2. τῷ πυρὶ γὰρ βρότος κτλ.: Des Places' text inadvertently omits θεόθεν from this line, although Des Places correctly translates "de Dieu". (See "Notes," p. 328, where Des Places now makes the appropriate correction in the text.) According to Lewy (pp. 173-174 and n. 406), "fire," "light," and "god" in this line all refer to Aion and not, *contra* Proclus, to the "light of the gods" in general. Thus the fragment describes, in Lewy's words, "the movement of the cognizer towards the noetic goal." Although "fire" and "light," in the *Oracles*, can refer specifically to the "intelligible light" of the Highest God and/or Aion (cf. φῶς and πῦρ in frr. 3, 5, 6, 49, 59, 115; see, also, Geudtner, pp. 66, n. 277; 77), these terms can also refer to the apparitions of various gods evoked during *autoptic* experiences. In this regard, cf. the use of φῶς and πῦρ in frr. 145-148. Thus, Lewy's interpretation, which is based on *Theos.* 13, 10 ff. (in Dodds' words, "a very weak" Chaldean source; see "New Light," p. 266 = Lewy$^2$, p. 695) is problematic.

## Fr. 122

**1. ἡ δὲ τῶν ἀγγέλων μερίς**: i.e., the angelic order is one of the "chains" linking various aspects of the cosmos. Cf. ἀγγελικῷ χώρῳ, fr. 138; μερίς, fr. 158; τάξις, frr. 24, 110; σειρά, fr. 203.

**2. τὴν ψυχὴν φέγγουσα πυρί**: i.e., once the soul is filled with "divine fire" it is no longer weighed down by matter. This anagogic function of the angelic order parallels that of fr. 123.

**3-4. τοῦ ἀχράντου πυρός**: In later Neoplatonic interpretation, the ἄχραντοι made up a specific class of angels who dwelled permanently in the supermundane regions. See Lewy, p. 261, n. 8.

**4-5. οὐκ ἐκροιζεῖται εἰς τὴν ὑλικὴν ἀταξίαν**: Forms of ῥοιζεῖν (in connection with matter) are common in the *Oracles*. See, esp., fr. 56 and notes to ῥοή for parallels.

**5. συνάπτεται**: For Proclus, "contact" (συναφή) is the third degree of prayer. See notes to fr. 121.

## Fr. 123

**1. ἀμιγῆ**: The notion of "mixing/unmixing" intellect/soul and matter (in both cosmological and soteriological contexts) is familiar to Platonism, Hermeticism, and Gnosticism alike. See Zandee, *Terminology*, p. 22, for several parallels. Cf. Jonas, *Gnostic Religion*, p. 58 ff.

**2. πνεύματι θερμῷ**: In the context of Proclus, "heat" and "breath" are anagogic powers. Cf., similarly, Hermias, *In Phaedrum*, 197, 2 C: θέρμην γὰρ καλεῖ τὴν ἀναγωγὸν δύναμιν. See, also, Proclus, *Exc. chald.*, II; 193,14-15 P., where "heat" and "cold" are contrasted in an anagogic context: τῷ θερμῷ προσδράμωμεν, τὸ ψυχρὸν ἐκφυγόντες. See, also, Iambl., *De myst.*, II.6; Cremer, pp. 50-51. Elsewhere in the *Oracles*, "heat" and "breath" are associated with the World Soul (or Hecate) as the source of life. Cf., esp., frr. 35, 53.

**3. κουφίζουσα**: i.e., to "lighten" the soul from the weight of matter so that it is free to ascend. This fragment as a whole may well allude to a breathing technique of some sort. Cf. frr. 124, 130 and notes. See Lewy, p. 278 and n. 81.

## Fr. 124

**1. ψυχῆς ἐξωστῆρες**: Psellus, *loc. cit.*, rightly adds: ἀπὸ τῆς σωματικῆς φύσεως.

ἀνάπνοοι: A possible allusion to a breathing technique as a means of suppressing the senses. Cf., e.g., *Mithras Liturgy* (ed. Meyer), p. 7: ἕλκε (cf. ἕλκουσαι, fr. 130) ἀπὸ τῶν ἀκτίνων πνεῦμα (cf. πνεύματι, fr. 123) γ' ἀνασπῶν, ὁ δύνασαι, καὶ ὄψῃ σεαυτὸν ἀνακουφιζόμενον (cf. κουφίζουσα, fr. 123) καὶ ὑπερβαίνοντα εἰς ὕψος, ὥστε σε δοκεῖν μέσον τοῦ ἀέρος εἶναι. Cf., also, *C.H.* XIII.7: ἐπίσπασαι εἰς ἑαυτόν...κατάργησον τοῦ σώματος τὰς αἰσθήσεις.

εὔλυτοι: i.e., "free" from material constraints and thus able to ascend. Lewy (p. 206, n. 124) understands this term to mean that "the purified soul is easily attracted by the ray of the sun." Cf. Proclus, *Exc. chald.*, II; 193,15-16 P.: ἔχομεν εὔλυτον ὁδὸν εἰς ἀνέλευσιν. Πατὴρ ὁδηγεῖ, πυρὸς ὁδοὺς ἀναπτύξασθαι. Cf., also, εὔλυτα φέγγη, fr. 125 and notes.

## Fr. 125

**1. ὁ δὶς ἐπέκεινα**: i.e., the Second or Demiurgic Intellect. Cf. fr. 169 and notes.

**3. εὔλυτα φέγγη**: Here, according to Lewy (p. 119, n. 201), synonymous with οἱ ἀμείλικτοι κεραυνοί (cf. frr. 35 and 36) as a designation for the Ideas. Des Places, however (p. 142, following Jahn), suggests a reference to the stars.

## Fr. 126

**2. πυρσὸν ἀνάψασα**: An allusion to the "kindling" of the "soul spark" or "flower/flame of mind." Cf. πυρσοὺς ἀκμαίους, fr. 130; τοὺς πυρσοὺς ἀνάπτουσαι τοὺς ἀναγωγούς, fr. 190; Synesius, *H.* 1(3), 124: ἐπὶ σοὺς πυρσούς. See Lewy, p. 261, n. 7 d.

## Fr. 127

**1. ἁπλάστῳ ψυχῇ**: Lewy (p. 171, n. 400) agrees with Psellus' interpretation that the "unformed soul" is ἁπλουστάτην and καθαρωτάτην (cf. ἐκ καθαρῆς ψυχῆς, fr. 213) but not that it is ἀμόρφωτον and ἀδιατύπωτον .

**πυρὸς ἡνία τεῖνον**: Psellus interprets the "reins of fire" correctly as τῆς τοιαύτης ψυχῆς τῆς θεουργικῆς ἐστι ζωῆς ἡ εὔλυτος (cf. εὔλυτοι, fr. 124) ἐνέργεια ἀνατείνουσα τὸν νοῦν τὸν πύρινον εἰς αὐτὸ τὸ θεῖον φῶς. Cf. ἐκτείνας πύριον νοῦν, fr. 128; τεῖναι κενεὸν νόον, fr. 1. Cf., also, τὸ ταρσὸν τοῦ πυρός, fr. 85, as an expression equivalent to πυρὸς ἡνία. The *locus classicus* of this imagery is that of the charioteer in Plato, *Phaedrus*, esp. 246 and 253. See Lewy, p. 171 and n. 398.

## Fr. 128

**1. ἐκτείνας πυρίον νοῦν**: Cf. νόου ταναοῦ ταναῇ φλογί and τεῖναι κενεὸν νόον, fr. 1 and notes; πυρὸς ἡνία τεῖνον, fr. 127 and notes. The "fiery intellect" of this fragment, then, is the equivalent to the "flower/flame of mind" and "spark of soul" (cf. fr. 44). See Lewy, p. 169 and n. 387; Hadot, *Porphyre*, I. p. 296 and n. 3.

**2. ἔργον ἐπ' εὐσεβίης**: According to Psellus, αἱ τῶν τελετῶν μέθοδι; i.e., the theurgic rites. Cf., in this sense, ἔργα, frr. 66 and 133; ἔργον, fr. 110. Cf., also, εὐσεβίης, fr. 107.

**ῥευστόν**: "Flowing" is characteristic of matter. Cf., esp., ῥευστά, fr. 134; ῥόθιον, fr. 186. See, also, Iren., *Adv. Haer.*, 1.5.5: ἀπὸ τοῦ κεχυμένου καὶ ῥευστοῦ τῆς ὕλης; *Tri. Trac.*, NHC I, 104,4: ϯϩγλη ετϩετε (as cited by Tardieu, "Oracles chaldaïques," p. 218).

**σῶμα σαώσεις**: In Lewy's interpretation (p. 216 and notes 157-158, following Psellus), it is a matter of "saving" the fleshly "body" from disease or demonic infection (and not an allusion to some form of corporeal "resurrection" in the Judeo-Christian sense as Kroll, *loc. cit.*, had suggested). In this regard, cf. Synesius, *H.* 1(3), 544-546: καὶ σώμα σάου/ἀρτεμές, ἐχθραῖς/ἄβατον λώβαις; 2(4), 275-276: Σῶμα δὲ σώζοι/καθαρὸν νούσων. But, elsewhere, Synesius uses the word σῶμα to designate the vehicle of the soul; e.g., *De insomn.*, 136 a: σῶμα πρῶτον ψυχῆς. Cf. τὸ αὐγοειδὲς σῶμα, fr. 120. Cf., also, the subsequent lines to the hymns of Synesius cited *supra*; 1(3), 547-548: καὶ πνεῦμα σάου/ἀμόλυντον, ἄναξ (cf. μὴ πνεῦμα μολύνῃς, fr. 104); 2(4), 277-278: πνεῦμα δὲ σώζοι/καθαρὸν λώβας. See,

also, σώζετε περίβλημα, fr. 129 (which the emperor Julian equates with σώματα) and the use of εἴδωλον in fr. 158. With this evidence, then, the oracle may well be advising "to save" the vehicle of the soul and not the fleshly "body" as such. And so Geudtner, pp. 20-24; cf. Theiler, 1942, p. 37 = 1966, pp. 296-297; Hadot, *Porphyre*, I, pp. 342-344 and n. 11. Such a position would accord with Iamblichus; see discussion in Introduction. One might also compare *Marsanes*, NHC X, 5,15-16, where "the entire defilement" (ⲡⲭⲱϩⲙ̄ ⲧⲏⲣϥ) is said to be "saved." Although, as Pearson suggests (*Nag Hammadi Codices IX and X*, notes *ad loc.*), "defilement" here may allude to the "sense-perceptible world" (αἰσθητὸς κόσμος) as a whole (which in lines 24-26 is specifically said to be "worthy of salvation"), it may also refer to the "soul garments" (ⲛ̄ϩⲃ̄ⲥⲱ ⲙ̄ⲯⲩⲭⲏ) mentioned in lines 7-8. (In this regard, cf., again, fr. 104: μὴ πνεῦμα μολύνῃς. The verb μολύνειν is the equivalent of the Coptic ϫⲱϩⲙ̄.) Thus, in both instances, the notion of "defilement" can be connected with the "vehicle" of the soul (as πνεῦμα or the "soul garments" of *Marsanes*). If this connection is valid, then the "salvation" of the soul's vehicle would be a doctrine common to both. On this notion, see further *infra*.

## Fr. 129

3. **σώζετε καὶ τὸ...περίβλημα βρότειον**: Here, the reference more clearly refers to "saving" the vehicle of the soul (*contra* Lewy, who again thinks in terms of "saving the mortal body" in a medical sense; see p. 214 and n. 151 and his similar interpretation of fr. 128). Cf., in this regard, *C.H.* X. 17-18, where the terms περίβολαιον, ἐνδύνατα, χιτῶνα, and πνεῦμα are all used to describe the material vestitures (or "vehicle") of the soul. Cf., also, Proclus, *El. Th.*, prop. 209: χιτώνων ἐνυλοτέρων. Although in the context of Julian, σώματα may have a fleshly, corporeal referent (and so the interpretation of Lewy; but cf. the use of σῶμα in fr. 128), the περίβλημα of this fragment must surely refer to the vehicle of the soul. See Geudtner, pp. 20-24; cf. Tardieu, "Oracles chaldaïques," pp. 202-203. See, also, the "soul garments" of *Marsanes*, as cited *supra*, fr. 128. The *locus classicus* of these ideas is Plato, *Crat.*, 400 c: τοῦτον δὲ περίβολον ἔχειν, ἵνα σῴζηται (in reference to the Orphic σῶμα-σῆμα equation.)

**πικρᾶς ὕλης**: Cf. ζητεῖ δὲ φυγεῖν τὸ πικρὸν χάος, Hipp., *Elenchos*, 5.10.2; p. 103, 15 W. (as cited by Tardieu, *ibid.*, p. 207, who also contrasts the "bitterness" of matter with the "sweetness"—ϩⲗⲁϭ; ⲙⲛ̄ⲧϩⲗ̄ϭⲉ—of the Father in various Valentinian sources). Cf., also, Plotinus, *Enn.* II.3.17.24-25: ὕλης...πικρᾶς καὶ πικρὰ ποιούσης.

## Fr. 130

1. **νοήσασαι τὰ ἔργα τοῦ πατρός**: A reference to the intelligible perception of the Ideas. Cf., esp., ἔργα νοήσας, fr. 39 and notes. Lewy (p. 212, n. 142) suggests this line may have made up the first verse of the oracle and proposes the following reconstruction: ὅσσοι δ' αὖ πατρὸς ἔργα νοήσασαι εὐλαβέονται. (In the context of Proclus, however, the fragment is cited in the context of his discussion of Plato, *Tim.* 41 e ff., re the demiurgic creation of souls and their "star" vehicles prior to embodiment.)

2. **μοίρης εἱμαρτῆς τὸ πτερὸν φεύγουσιν ἀναιδὲς**: The literary model is *Il.* 4, 488: μοῖραν δ' οὔ τινα φημὶ πεφυγμένον ἔμμεναι ἀνδρῶν. In the *Oracles*, it is the

theurgist who escapes Fate (cf. fr. 153). Cf., also, Proclus, *De prov.*, 164,27-28; p. 130,15-16 B.: "Quicumque, aiunt, patris opera intelligentes reverendi fient, sortis fatalem alam effugiunt." See Lewy, *ibid.*; Festugière, *Tim.*, V, p. 141 and notes 1-2; Theiler, 1942, p. 33 = 1966, p. 292.

**ἀναιδές**: Elsewhere (cf. frr. 89, 135), descriptive of evil demons which, of course, pervade Nature/Destiny.

**4. ἐν θεῷ κεῖνται**: According to Lewy (p. 198, n. 88), analogous to θεὸν ἄγξει, fr. 97. Thus, in both instances, θεός (in Lewy's interpretation) refers to Aion. (See Lewy, esp. p. 201 ff.) The expression "to rest in God" is common. Cf., e.g., Synesius, *Dio*, 7, 46 B; Iambl., *De myst.*, V.26; Plotinus, *Enn.* IV.2.1.9. Cf., also, Augustine, *Conf.* 1.1: "Donec requiescat in te," and the eschatological "rest" (ἀνάπαυσις) of *Marsanes*, NHC X, 2,16. See Lewy, p. 197, n. 86; Cremer, p. 46 ff.; Geudtner, 76-77; Zandee, *Terminology*, pp. 33-38. Cf., also, the recent study of J. Helderman, *Die Anapausis im Evangelium Veritatis*, (Leiden, 1984).

**πυρσοὺς ἀκμαίους**: An allusion to the noetic or intelligible "rays" of the Highest God, which correspond to the "flower/flame of mind" in the human soul. Cf. πυρσόν, fr. 126; τοὺς πυρσοὺς τοὺς ἀναγωγούς, fr. 190.

**ἕλκουσαι**: Perhaps an allusion to a breathing technique of some sort. Cf. notes to ἀνάπνοοι, fr. 124. This verse is also repeated verbatim by Damascius (*Comm. Phaedo* I, § 169, but substituting ἕλκοντες for ἕλκουσαι). Westerink (notes *ad loc.*) suggests that the proper sense here is that of "breathing," "drinking," or "feeding" on sunlight.

**5. ἐκ πατρόθεν**: Cf. πατρόθεν, fr. 37; <ἐκ> πατρόθεν, fr. 77.

**6. ἐμπυρίων δρέπεται καρπῶν...ἄνθος**: The "flower of fiery fruits" is equivalent to the "flowering flames" (*supra*) as the noetic/empyrean source of the "flower/flame of mind." Cf. δρεπτόμεναι πυρὸς ἄνθος, fr. 37; δρεψάμενος νόου ἄνθος, fr. 49; Proclus, *In Tim.*, III, 82,12: πληροῖ δὲ τὰς ψυχὰς τῶν ἐμπυρίων καρπῶν; *Exc. chald.*, I; p. 192,20-21 Pitra: τέλος δὲ τῶν ἀνόδων ἡ μετουσία τῶν θείων καρπῶν; Synesius, *H.* 1(3), 639-641: πυρίων δ' ἔργων/καὶ τῇδε δίδου/μάρτυρα καρπόν. As a whole, the fragment suggests that the "rest" in Aion prepares the "flower/flame of mind" for the contemplative perception of the Highest God (such as described in fr. 1). See further discussion in Introduction.

## Fr. 131

**2. τὸν Παῖανα**: In the context of Damascius, a reference to Asclepius Paean. Lewy, however (p. 200, n. 102), suggests that a "paean" or hymn was sung by the ascending soul to praise the harmony of the universe. (Cf. ἁρμονίαν fr. 97 and notes.) The singing of hymns (in both the ordinary and "ineffable" sense) is a common element in anagogic experiences. See discussion in Introduction.

## Fr. 132

**1. καὶ...ἐνεδείξατο**: This line constitutes fr. 191.

**2. σῖγ' ἔχε**: In the context of Proclus, the initiate is counselled to be "silent" in the prescence of the "ineffable" order of the intelligible or Empyrean World. (See fr. 191 and notes.) "Silence" is not only the proper response of the initiate at this point, but characterizes the supercelestial realm as a whole. Cf., e.g., σιγῇ τῶν πατέρων, fr. 16 and notes. "Silence" (interspersed with prayers and/or

hymns) is also a common feature of both Hermetic and Gnostic patterns of ascent. See, e.g., *C.H.* XIII.16; *Disc. 8-9*, NHC VI, 58,20-25; 59,19-22; 60,1-5; *Steles Seth*, NHC VII, 127,13-16; *Allogenes*, NHC XI, 60,15-18. Cf., also, Synesius, *H.* 2(4), 82-86; *Mithras Liturgy* (ed. Meyer), pp. 9; 13; 21.

**μύστα**: Cf. Proclus, *In Tim.*, III, 271, 24-25: κατὰ τὴν θεῶν αὐτῶν φήμην, ἣν τοῖς ἑαυτῶν "μύσταις" παρέδοσαν. See Lewy, p. 177, n. 2, who suggests that this comment points to the existence of a "mystery cult" in connection with the Chaldean rites.

## Fr. 133

**3. ἱερεύς**: Equivalent to ὁ θεουργός.

**πυρὸς ἔργα**: i.e., the theurgic operations. Here, perhaps, an *epoptic* experience; cf. fr. 146 re the "fiery" apparitions of Hecate. Cf., also, πυρὸς ἀφθίτου ἔργα, fr. 66.

**4. κύματι...ἅλμης**: Purifications via sea-water were widely practiced in Antiquity. Marinus (*Vita Procli*, 18) tells us that Proclus indulged in numerous καθαρμοί (both Orphic and Chaldean), including bathing in the sea at least once a month. Cf., also, Proclus, *De Magia,* 151,10-12 Bidez, where Proclus mentions purifications via περιρραίνοντες θαλάττῃ and ἀσφάλτῳ ("sulphur").

## Fr. 134

**2. μηδὲ σπεύδειν**: One "hastens" or "flees" to the world of light, not to the material world of darkness. Cf., esp., χρὴ σπεύδειν πρὸς τὸ φάος κτλ., fr. 115; χρεὼ φεύγειν, v. 5. Cf., also, μηδέ κάτω νεύσῃς, frr. 163 and 164.

**ἐπὶ μισοφαῆ κόσμον**: The material world is described as "light-hating" because it is the farthest removed from the intelligible world of light. Cf. ὁ μισοφαὴς κόσμος, fr. 181; τὸν μελαναυγέα κόσμον, fr. 163; Psellus, *P.G.*, 122, 1149 c 3-4: ὁ ἔσχατος χθόνιος εἴρηται καὶ μισοφαής, ὅστις ἐστιν ὁ ὑπὸ σελήνην τόπος.

**λάβρον ὕλης**: Matter is "boisterous" because of its passionate element. Cf., *ibid.*, fr. 180.

**4. αὐχμηραί**: Cf. αὐχμηράν, fr. 100.

**ἔργα ῥευστά**: "Flowing" is characteristic of matter. Cf., esp., ῥευστόν, fr. 128 and notes. See, also, the discussion of Saffrey, *loc. cit.* and p. 65, who suggests that the inclusion of this line verbatim in Empedocles, καθαρμοί (fr. 121, Diels), is not part of the original text but a later interpolation based on our fragment.

**5. πατρὸς νοῦ**: Equivalent to πατρικὸς νόος; cf. frr. 39, 49, 108, 109. As a whole, then, the oracle underscores the importance of disengaging oneself from the thrall of matter if the *anagōgē* to the intelligible world is to be successful.

## Fr. 135

**3. πρὶν σῶμα τελεσθῇς**: A probable reference to the type of lustrations described in fr. 133 (see Lewy, p. 227, n. 1). Another possibility, however, is that the term σῶμα here may allude to the vehicle of the soul (cf. the use of σῶμα in fr. 128 and notes), and thus the initiation mentioned here would include the various "material" rites specified, e.g., by Psellus, *P.G.*, 122, 1132 a 11-12. See notes to ἔργον, fr. 110.

**4. ὄντες γὰρ χθόνιοι...κύνες εἰσὶν ἀναιδεῖς**: Cf. χθόνιοι κύνες, fr. 90 and ἀναιδές, fr. 89, as similarly descriptive of evil demons.

5. **προστίθησιν**: Saffrey, *loc. cit.*, suggests that the use of this verb indicates that the first and third verses (as cited by Proclus) were part of the same oracle. He reconstitutes the oracle by adding δαίμονες as part of a missing first verse, keeping verses one and two as is, and replacing τάς with καί in verse 3.

6. **τὰς ψυχὰς θέλγοντες**: Cf. Psellus, *Hypotyp.*, 23: καὶ θέλγον τὰς ψυχὰς ἢ κολάζον τὰς ἐρήμας ἀπολειφθείσας τοῦ θείου φωτός (with specific reference to the demons described in fr. 89). See Lewy, p. 264 and n. 15.

## Fr. 136

2. **ἐν τάξει**: Cf. ἔν τινι τάξει, fr. 110 and notes.

4. **ζώσῃ δυνάμει**: Cf. ἐν δυνάμει ζῶν, fr. 137 (with reference to the angelic order). But the reference here is obscure. Lewy, p. 263 and n. 11, sees an allusion here to Hecate as δύναμις, but such a possibility is unlikely; and so Cremer, p. 64, n. 227.

**κενεὰς ἐπὶ πέμπει ἀταρπούς**: In other words, if the proper order of ascent is not followed, the initiate is led astray by God (Aion?) himself via demonic temptation. See Lewy's discussion, pp. 262-263.

5. **ἀτάκτως καὶ πλημμελῶς**: Cf. fr. 2, where the initiate is analogously counselled to approach the "empyrean channels" μηδ'...σπόραδην...ἀλλὰ στιβαρηδόν.

## Fr. 137

1. **ἄγγελος**: Angels made up one of the "orders" or "chains" (see fr. 138) of the Chaldean hierarchy and performed an anagogic role during the Chaldean rites (cf. frr. 122 and 123).

**ἐν δυνάμει ζῶν**: Here, "power" is clearly connected with the angelic order (in contrast to the more ambiguous use of ζώσῃ δυνάμει, *supra*, fr. 136).

2. **ἱερατικός**: Another designation for theurgy (cf. διὰ τῆς ἱερατικῆς θεουργίας ἀναβαίνειν, Iambl., *De myst.*, VIII.4), although the term has a broader application. Among the later Neoplatonists, Iamblichus is regularly regarded as the first *hieratikos*. See Lewy, Exc. IV, p. 464; Cremer, pp. 24-25.

## Fr. 138

3. **ἀγγελικῷ ἐνὶ χώρῳ**: In the context of Olympiodorus (which is a commentary on *Phaedo*, 72 b 1-3), the point is that the post-mortem soul of the theurgist chooses to descend from the intelligible to the material sphere (via the angelic order), presumably to aid the ascent of souls (cf., in this regard, frr. 122, 123). See, also, Porphyry, *De philos. ex or. haur.*; Wolff, pp. 144-145, where Porphyry distinguishes a class of angels which remain in the presence of the Father (and, thus, remain in the intelligible realm), and those which function as ministering angels apart from the Father (see further discussion in Introduction). The implication, then, is that the theurgist (as a member of the "angelic" chain)—although not compelled to reincarnate (cf. fr. 160 and notes)—might choose to do so in order to help others. In this regard, cf. Psellus' report in *De aurena catena* (as cited by Lewy, p. 224 and n. 125) that Julian the Chaldean "prayed" that his son-to-be (Julian the Theurgist) would receive the "soul" of an "archangel." The figure of Osiris in Synesius' *De Providentia* is undoubtedly based

on this notion. See Hadot, *Porphyre*, I, pp. 394-395 and notes 2-3; Cremer, pp. 64-67; Smith, *Porphyry's Place*, p. 132 and n. 18; Westerink, *loc. cit.*, *ad not.*

## Fr. 139

**2-3. τὴν πυριθαλπῆ ἔννοιαν**: A reference to the "kindling" of the "spark of soul," or "flower/flame of mind" (see Festugière, *Tim.*, II, p. 33, n. 1; cf. πυρσὸν ἀνάψασα, fr. 126). Lewy, however (p. 87, n. 77), thinks this expression refers to the World Soul as a specific object of worship, but this is unlikely. Note, also, that Lewy mistakenly reads περιθαλπῆ here, a textual error repeated by Des Places.

**4. πρωτίστην...τάξιν ἐν τῇ ἱερᾷ θρησκείᾳ**: In the context of Proclus, a reference to the first stage of prayer (see fr. 121 and notes) which comprises knowledge (γνῶσις) of all the classes of the gods.

## Fr. 140

**2. δηθύνοντι**: The proper sense of this verb is problematic. Lewy (p. 42 and n. 132, following Kroll) equates this fragment as a whole with fr. 141 (but in a positive sense) to mean that the "mortal" is "slow" to free the god in a mediumistic trance. Festugière (*Tim.*, II, p. 34, n. 1) notes rightly that Lewy's interpretation does not fit Proclus' context and, thus, prefers to translate: "Les Bienheureux sont prompts à frapper le mortel lent à prier" (and so Des Places). But Festugière's "à frapper" is gratuitous. In addition, since the context of Proclus is that of "continuous" (ἀδιαλείπτως) worship, then the sense of δηθύνοντι—with regard to prayer—must have the sense of "tarrying" or "prolonging" prayer (rather than "slow to pray" as Festugière suggests). Thus, the sense of the fragment must be that the gods or "blessed ones" are quick to respond on behalf of those who "tarry" or "linger" in prayer. Cf., also, in a slightly different sense, the translation of Bremond, "Un Texte de Proclus," p. 454: "Si le mortel tarde de prier, les dieux bienheureux sont prompte à achever."

**χραιπνοί**: Cf. χραιπνήν, fr. 87.

**μάκαρες**: Cf. νοερῶν μακάρων, fr. 56; μακάρων, fr. 160.

## Fr. 141

**2. ἔκλυσις...θεοῦ**: i.e., the "freeing" or "loosing" of the god bound by the medium. "Binding" and "loosing" are common magical techniques. See Lewy, p. 42 and n. 132 and discussion in Introduction.

**νωθρὸς βροτός**: i.e., the mortal weighed down by matter.

**ἐς τάδε νεύων**: cj. Cousin; ἐς τάδ' ἔχων, codd. In the *Oracles*, forms of νεύειν (cf. frr. 163 and 164) describe the turning of the soul towards matter. Thus, the fragment states that the medium who is unable to concentrate on his divine work (because of material distractions) "loosens" the conjured diety, thus negating the theurgic act. Cf., in a similar sense, fr. 211 and notes. In the context of Proclus, however, this verse is integrated into a discussion of the *via negativa* approach to the One (where it seems awkwardly out of place). Cf. Morrow-Dillon, p. 442, n. 74.

## Fr. 142

**2. σώματα**: The apparitions of the gods were not necessarily in human form but could assume various symbolic shapes. Cf. the apparitions described in frr. 145-148 and see Lewy, pp. 246-247 and n. 68.

**αὐτοπτοῖς φάσμασιν**: Cf., esp., Marinus, *Vita Procli*, 28 (with regard to Hecate): ἐν τάξει (cf. fr. 110) ὁ φιλόσοφος (sc. Proclus) τοῖς Χαλδαϊκοῖς καθαρμοῖς καθαιρόμενος (cf. fr. 133), φάσμασι μὲν Ἑκατικοῖς φωτοειδέσιν αὐτοπτουμένοις ὡμίλησεν. The terms αὐτοπτός, αὐτοψία, and αὐτοφανεία all comprise the vocabulary of divine self-manifestation. See Eitrem, "La Théurgie," p. 56 ff. and discussion in Introduction.

## Fr. 143

**2. σώματα...ὑμῶν ἕνεκεν ἐνδέδεται**: Cf. *ibid.*, fr. 142.

**4. σωματικὴν εἰς ἣν ἐνεκεντρίσθητε φύσιν**: A reference to the soul's entrapment in matter. Cf. Synesius, *De insomn.*, 138 c: φύσιν δὲ ἔχει τὴν ἄπαξ ἐγκεκεντρισμένην εἰς αὐτὸ ψυχὴν ἢ ὁμορροθεῖν ἢ ἕλκειν ἢ ἕλκεσθαι. See Lewy, p. 246 and n. 68.

## Fr. 144

**1. ἐν τουτῷ (φῶτι)**: For Simplicus, a reference specifically to τὸ φῶς τὸ ὑπὲρ τὸ ἐμπύριον μονάδα ( = Paternal Monad; see notes to φαός, fr. 51).

**2. τὰ ἀτύπωτα τυποῦσθαί**: According to Simplicus, it is in the supra(!)-Empyrean light of the Highest God that the gods take shape as τὰ αὐτοπτικὰ θεάματα. Elsewhere, however (616, 18-20), Simplicius suggests that this "forming" process takes place within the Ethereal World. See Lewy, p. 244, n. 63.

## Fr. 145

**2. μορφὴν φωτός**: Another reference to a luminous apparition of one of the gods (perhaps Hecate). See Lewy, p. 244, n. 63.

**3. ἄνω**: In the context of Proclus, a reference to the Empyrean (or intelligible) World. Cf., similarly, the use of ἄνω in frr. 112, 116.

**ἀμόρφωτος**: Cf. ἀτύπωτα, fr. 144; πῦρ ἀτύπωτον, fr. 146; μορφῆς ἄτερ, fr. 148.

**διὰ τὴν πρόοδον ἐγένετο μεμορφωμένη**: In Proclus' interpretation, the "forming" or "shaping" of the gods takes place as a result of "procession;" i.e., the second movement of the process μονή, πρόοδος, ἐπιστροφή. But this is a Neoplatonic, not Chaldean, doctrine. See Hadot, *Porphyre*, I, pp. 379 and n. 4; 407. Theiler, 1942, p. 18 = 1966, p. 273, cites Synesius *H.* 3(5), 59: χαίρος, ὦ πατρὸς μορφά (with reference to Christ as the "Son") as a reflection of this fragment. Similarly, cf. M. Victorinus, *H.* III, 151 ff.: "Forma filius...omnis forma Christus est."

## Fr. 146

**1. ἡ μυσταγωγία**: A reference to the Chaldean tradition. Cf., e.g., Iambl., *De myst.*, I.11: τῆς ἱερατικῆς μυσταγωγίας. See Lewy, Exc. I, p. 444 e.

**θεοπαράδοτος**: Again, an expression associated with the *Oracles*. Cf. Marinus, *Vita Procli*, 26: τὰ θεοπαράδοτα λόγια. See Lewy, *ibid.*

**2. ταῦτ' ἐπιφωνήσας**: The "invocation" alluded to here probably consisted of uttering *nomina barbara* combined with the offering of sacred *materia* to the god invoked (in this case, Hecate). See Lewy, p. 240, n. 52.

**παιδί**: According to Lewy (p. 241), the various **παῖδες** of this fragment refer to discarnate souls deprived of proper burial rites and who traditionally accompanied Hecate on her nighttime wanderings.

**3. πῦρ**: The fiery apparitions of this fragment again suggest that the deity invoked is Hecate. Lewy (p. 241, n. 53) cites as a parallel, *PGM* IV. 2727: Δεῦρ', Ἑκάτη, τριοδῖτι, πυρίπνοα φάσματ' ἔχουσα. As such, these fiery apparitions preceded Hecate's epiphany.

**σκιρτηδόν**: Cf. *ibid.*, fr. 148.

**4. πῦρ ἀτύπωτον**: Cf. τὰ ἀτύπωτα, fr. 144.

**φωνήν**: Cf. πυρὸς φωνήν, fr. 148 and notes.

**5. ἀμφὶ γύην**: Lewy (p. 241, n. 53) suggests that the conjuration of Hecate took place in the open countryside. Cf. fr. 224 in this regard.

**ῥοιζαῖον**: Common to the *Oracles*. Cf., esp., **ῥοή**, fr. 56 and notes for parallels.

**6. ἵππον**: Horses were traditionally associated with Hecate. See Lewy, p. 242 and n. 55.

**7. ἐποχούμενον**: Here, literally; but cf. frr. 36 and 193, where this term is used in a metaphysical sense.

**9. τοξεύοντα**: In Lewy's interpretation (p. 242, n. 54), the "archer" here represents those unburied heroes who have suffered a violent death; therefore, like the **παῖδες**, they were doomed to accompany Hecate on her various wanderings.

## Fr. 147

**1. μοι**: The speaker is Hecate; see Lewy, p. 242, n. 57.

**πάντα λέοντα**: codd. But Lewy, (*ibid.*, following Lobeck, *Aglaoph.*, 104) prefers the reading πάντ' ἀχλύοντα and thus understands the oracle as referring to various cosmic perturbations that preceded the manifestation of Hecate. In Psellus' interpretation, however, λέοντα is understood as a zodiacal reference. For Psellus, the fragment as a whole alludes to the invocation and manifestation of this "leonine source" during the course of a Chaldean rite. But a "leonine" allusion to Hecate is also possible. Cf. Kroll, p. 30: "Leones autem matris magnae currum vehunt."

**2-4. οὔτε γὰρ οὐράνιος...χθὼν οὐχ ἕστηκεν**: Cf. Iambl., *De myst.*, II.4: καὶ τὸν ἥλιον καὶ τὴν σελήνην τε γῆν μηκέτι δύνασθαι ἑστάναι αὐτῶν κατιόντων (sc. τῶν θεῶν). This is a paraphrase of our fragment. See Lewy, *ibid.*, who also notes that Hecate, in the Chaldean tradition, was regarded as a celestial, not chthonian deity. Cf., e.g., frr. 219 and 221.

**4. κεραυνοῖς**: Elsewhere, descriptive of the Ideas. Cf. fr. 35.

## Fr. 148

**1. μορφῆς ἄτερ**: Analogous to ἀτύπωτα, fr. 144; ἀτύπωτον, fr. 146. Cf., also, μορφήν, fr. 145.

**εὐΐερον πῦρ**: Descriptive of the Empyrean World. Cf., e.g., ἱερός, fr. 73 and notes. See, also, fr. 144 and notes, where Simplicius states that the gods are formed in the Empyrean light of the Father. In Psellus' interpretation, this fire is "very holy" ὡς ἐν καλῷ τοῖς ἱερατικοῖς ἄνδρασιν (sc. τοῖς θεουργοῖς) ὁρώμενον.

**2. σκιρτηδόν**: Cf. *ibid.*, fr. 146. Psellus paraphrases this term as ἱλαρῶς καὶ χαρίεντως.

**κατὰ βένθεα κόσμου**: Here, the "depths" of the terrestrial world. Cf., in this sense, the use of βυθός and βάθος in fr. 163 as descriptive of τὸν μελαναυγέα κόσμον. Cf., also, Synesius, *H.* 1(3), 631; 5(2), 49: βένθεα κόσμου. Lewy (p. 244 and n. 63), citing Iambl., *De myst.*, II.7 (ψυχῆς δὲ τῆς μὲν ὅλης...πῦρ ὁρᾶται ἀνείδεον περὶ ὅλον τὸν κόσμον) equates the World Soul of this similarly worded passage with Hecate, and thus understands this fragment as an invocation of the goddess. See, also, Cremer, pp. 99-100.

**3. κλῦθι πυρὸς φωνήν**: Cf. πῦρ ἀτύπωτον, ὅθεν φωνὴν προθέουσαν, fr. 146. Evidently Hecate communicated with the theurgist from the midst of her fiery apparition. Cf., esp., *C.H.* I.4: φωνῇ πυρός. See Nock-Festugière, *Corpus Hermeticum*, I, notes *ad loc.*

## Fr. 149

**1. δαίμονα πρόσγειον**: An evil demon. Cf. the χθόνιοι κύνες of frr. 90, 91, and 135. Psellus adds that such demons are τῆς ἀφεγγοῦς ὕλης ἀναπεπλησμένοι.

**2. λίθον μνίζουριν**: Offering the *mnizouris* stone (derivation conjectural; see Lewy, p. 290, n. 117; Des Places, p. 103) was a means of placating hylic demons during the course of a theurgic rite. Elsewhere, Psellus (*P.G.*, 122, 1132 a 11-12), indicates that the offering of λίθοις also helped purify the ὄχημα τῆς ψυχῆς.

## Fr. 150

**1. ὀνόματα βάρβαρα**: The *nomina barbara* had magical efficacy in the sacred rites, and can be equated with the συνθήματα/σύμβολα. (See, also, the discussion in Iambl., *De myst.*, VIII.4-5 and *C.H.* XVI.2 on this same subject.) Unfortunately, however, the extant fragments do not preserve any of these magical formulae. But such strings of vowel and consonant sounds are preserved in numerous parallel sources. Cf., e.g., *Gos. Eg.*, NHC III, 66,8-9 = IV, 78, 11; 66,13-20 = 78,17-19; *Disc. 8-9*, NHC VI, 56,17-21; 61,10-15; *Mithras Liturgy* (ed. Meyer), *passim*. See Lewy, pp. 239-240 and notes; discussion in Introduction.

## Fr. 151

**2. συνοχηΐδας**: Although Proclus uses this term here in a mathematical context, as a Chaldean expression it is analogous to forms of συνοχεύς. Cf. frr. 32, 80, 82, 177, 207. See Lewy, p. 109 and n. 173. Kroll, *loc. cit.*, suggests an allusion to "figuras magicas."

## Fr. 152

**1. (ὁ ἅπαξ ἐπέκεινα)**: i.e., the Father or Highest God. See fr. 169 and notes.

**2. ἀμιστύλλευτος**: This expression underscores the unity of the Highest God, who is not subject to any form of division. (Cf. Damascius, II, 43, 23, who equates this term with ἀμερής.) The process of division begins only at the level of the Second God; cf., e.g., μετρεῖται, fr. 31 and notes. See, also, Lewy, p. 81, n. 56; Des Places, p. 145; Hadot, *Porphyre*, I, p. 296 and notes 8-10.

## Fr. 153

**1. ταύτῃ (sc. τῇ πεντάδι)**: In the context of Lydus, the equation of the number "five" with Heimarmene is also cited as a Pythagorean doctrine.

**τὰς ἀποκαθισταμένας ψυχάς**: This expression alludes to the Neoplatonic doctrine of the re-establishment or re-integration of souls at the end of a world-cycle (see Dodds, *Proclus: El. Th.*, p. 302.) But Lydus' use of this terminology in connection with the number "five" (as equivalent to Heimarmene) is unclear.

**3. ὑφ' εἱμαρτήν**: In a Chaldean context, a reference to the corruption of material nature. (Cf. frr. 102 and 103, where εἱμαρμένη and φύσις are equated.) Thus, the fragment states that the theurgists are not subject to the passions of nature. Cf., Iambl., *De myst.*, V.18: ἡ πολλὴ μὲν ἀγέλη (see *infra*) τῶν ἀνθρώπων ὑποτέτακται ὑπὸ τὴν φύσιν...συμπληροί τε τῆς εἱμαρμένης τὴν διοίκησιν. See Lewy, p. 212 and n. 143. Cf. Tardieu, "Oracles chaldaïques," pp. 222-225, who argues, *contra* Lewy, that this verse reflects the idea of astral fatalism, a view now accepted by Des Places ("Notes," p. 328). Cf., also, fr. 130, v. 1.

**ἀγέλην**: Cf. ἀγεληδόν, fr. 154. In the passage cited *supra*, Iamblichus distinguishes three classes of men: a) the "herd" (ἡ ἀγελή), or the mass of men dominated by the passions; b) the "few" (οἱ ὀλίγοι), or those men "separated" from the passions; c) the "ones in between" (ἔνιοι δὲ μεταξύ), or those who—in Iamblichus' words—are "between" ἡ φύσις and ὁ καθαρὸς νοῦς. Cremer (pp. 123-130) believes this tripartite distinction may well have originated with the Chaldean tradition (with the "few" equivalent to the theurgists). See further discussion in Introduction.

## Fr. 154

**1. φευκτέον**: Cf., esp., χρεὼ φεύγειν, fr. 134.

**2. ἀγεληδόν**: Cf. ἀγέλην, fr. 153. In the context of Proclus, the "herd" is comprised of those men who are embroiled in "opinions" as well as "irrational pleasures." See Lewy, p. 55 and n. 171.

## Fr. 155

**2 + 4. δύσκαμπτος καὶ ὀπισθοβαρὴς...φωτός**: Kroll, *loc. cit.*, (following Schoell) believed this verse to be authentic. (Schoell reconstructed the hexameter by placing φωτός before ἄμοιρος; and so Des Places, p. 104.) However, Lewy (p. 278, n. 77) rejects a Chaldean origin, noting that ὀπισθοβαρής is a Plotinian term (e.g., *Enn.* VI.9.4.22) and that Proclus, elsewhere, never uses the expression ὡς εἰπεῖν to introduce Chaldean terms. But cf. Geudtner, p. 12, n. 56, who suggests that the phrase "ἐμβριθεῖς καὶ ὀπισθοβαρεῖς" (used by Proclus, *In Crat.*, 69,10) may have been the beginning of a Chaldean hexameter. Since Synesius (who antedates Proclus) uses similar terminology (e.g., *H.* 1(3), 523: βρίθει; 2(4), 289: τοὺς χθονοβριθεῖς; 5(2), 88: ἐπιβρίσῃ; *De insomn.*, 138 c:...βρῖθον...βαρυνθῆαι), a Chaldean origin must still be considered a likely possibility for our fragment. Cf., also, βρίθοντα, fr. 213. The *locus classicus* of this terminology is Plato, e.g., *Phaedo*, 81 c; *Phaedrus*, 246 d. In this regard, Festugière (*Rév.*, III, p. 53, n. 7) suggests that Plotinus and the Chaldeans would be utilizing this common Platonic vocabulary, since it is doubtful that Plotinus ever directly borrowed from the *Oracles*. See, also, the similar remarks of Hadot, "Bilan et perspectives," Lewy$^2$, pp. 709-711.

## Fr. 156

**1. κυνῶν ἀλόγων**: i.e., evil demons. Cf. frr. 90, 91, 135; Proclus, *In Tim.*, III, 157,27: εἴπερ γάρ εἰσιν δαίμονες, ὡς οἱ θεουργοὶ λέγουσιν. See, also, Lewy, p. 264 and n. 16.

**2. οἱ ζῶντες πονηρὰν ζωήν**: Equivalent to the "herd" of frr. 153 and 154.

## Fr. 157

**1. ἀγγεῖον**:Psellus correctly interprets this term (albeit circuitously) as referring to the human body. The image of the body as a "vessel" is common. Cf., e.g., Philo, *Post. Cain.*, 137; *Migr. Abr.*, 193; 197. See, also, **κύτος**, fr. 186 and notes; Lewy, p. 265 and n. 19.

**θῆρες χθονός**: Again, evil demons. Cf., esp., **θηροπόλον**, fr. 89 and notes.

## Fr. 158

**1. (τὸ πνεῦμα)**: i.e., the vehicle of the soul. Cf., esp., **πνεῦμα**, fr. 104 and notes.

**4. τὸ τῆς ὕλης σκύβαλον**: In the context of Synesius, an equivalent term for the **πνεῦμα** or vehicle of the soul. Psellus, however, *loc. cit.*, mistakenly interprets this term as referring to the body (**σῶμα**) as a whole (influenced here by the Jewish parallels of Elijah and Enoch, who were "translated" bodily to Heaven; this notion of a "corporeal" resurrection is also the opinion of Kroll, *loc. cit.*). Lewy (p. 213 and notes 144-146), although rightly rejecting the idea of a "corporeal" resurrection as an authentic Chaldean teaching, nonetheless still understands **τὸ σκύβαλον** as referring to the fleshly body and not the vehicle of the soul. Lewy's interpretation is based on his erroneous understanding of **σκύβαλον** and **εἰδώλῳ** as contrasting rather than equivalent terms (see *infra*).

**χρημνῷ**: In Psellus' interpretation, a reference to the Material World (cf. **χρημνός**, fr. 164). Although Lewy (*ibid.*) thinks that this term refers specifically here to Tartarus (in the Underworld sense), the Chaldean conflation of Tartarus with the world of matter (see fr. 164 and notes) makes such a singular judgement problematic.

**5. εἰδώλῳ**: In Synesius' interpretation, equivalent to **τὸ τῆς ὕλης σκύβαλον** as descriptive of the **πνεῦμα** or vehicle of the soul. Cf. Porphyry, *Sent.* 29; p. 18 [13,7-14,1 M.], 3-12 L., where **εἴδωλον** and **πνεῦμα** are similarly equated. (See Lacombrade, *Synésios*, pp. 156; 164-169; Geudtner, p. 22; Hadot, *Porphyre*, I, p. 343, n. 11; Dillon, *Iamblichi Fragmenta*, 373, n. 1; Des Places, p. 155, who all agree with Synesius' interpretation.) Since Psellus equates **εἰδώλῳ** here with the irrational soul (**ἡ ἄλογος ψυχή**) and not the vehicle per se, it is possible that the Chaldeans may well have have conflated the two without clear distinctions.

Lewy, however (p. 219), interprets **εἰδώλῳ** here as referring to the soul in general, contrasting **εἰδώλῳ** (as soul) with **τὸ σκύβαλον** (as body). According to Lewy, the oracle as a whole promises the Chaldean initiate that his "body" (or "the dregs of matter") will be saved from post-mortem demonic persecution, while his "soul" (or "image") will travel upward. However, the oracle is not contrasting but equating **τὸ σκύβαλον** and **εἰδώλῳ**. Thus, the oracle promises the initiate that his vehicle (= "the dregs of matter" and "image") will also be saved (cf. frr. 128, 129 and notes in this regard). Since Lewy (p. 219, n. 168, following Dodds) rejects the possibility that the Chaldeans taught the post-mortem

survival of the soul's vehicle, he is necessarily driven to this particular reading of the fragment. But the majority of more recent scholars (see *supra*) accepts Synesius' interpretation of this fragment as an accurate reflection of Chaldean teaching.

**μερίς**: Equivalent to τάξις. Cf. Synesius, *ibid.*, 141 b: ἔχει γὰρ τινα, φησίν, ἐν αὐτῷ μερίδα, τοῦτ' ἔστιν ἐν τάξει τινι τοῦ κυκλικοῦ γίνεται. Cf., also, fr. 110 and notes.

**εἰς τόπον ἀμφιφάοντα**: Descriptive of the Empyrean or intelligible World (cf. ἀμφιφαοῦς, fr. 1 and notes). In Synesius' interpretation (141 b), the vehicle of the soul (here, τὴν μέσην φύσιν) becomes situated at the "summit of the elements" where it γεύσαιτ' ἂν τοῦ ἀμφιφαοῦς (of the intelligible order). In Psellus' interpretation, it is the irrational soul which finds a place "above the moon." Thus, in both instances, the ὄχημα-πνεῦμα and/or irrational soul finds a permanent post-mortem dwelling place at the level of the Ethereal order.

## Fr. 159

**1-2. βίῃ...κατάρατοι**: This fragment is particularly difficult and has been variously emended and interpreted. Psellus, for one, interprets the fragment in a Christian context and sees an allusion to Christian martyrs whose violent deaths render their souls "purer" than those who have died by illness. Lewy (p. 205 and n. 122) keeps Psellus' reading of καθαρώταται (although omitting ἀνθρώπων) and translates: "The souls of those who have left their bodies violently are the purest." For Lewy, this statement refers to a "mystic voluntary suicide" on the part of the Chaldean initiate. But such a conjecture is gratuitous. As Dodds ("New Light," p. 269 = Lewy$^2$, p. 698 and n. 21) points out, "Olympiodorus" (= Damascius, *In Phaed.*, 369 (243, 4-6 N.) W.) distinguishes a "theurgic" death from that by suicide or violence. Dodds prefers Kroll's emendation of κατάρατοι (and sees a reference here to the βιαιοθάνατοι; i.e., the ghosts of those improperly buried, such as those killed in battle, who are doomed to restlessly wander the earth). I would agree with this interpretation and see a connection with fr. 146, where various ghostly apparitions are associated with Hecate.

However, another interpretation has been suggested by M. L. West (*CR*, N.S. 18, 1968, pp. 257-258) and subsequently adopted by Des Places. West has restored the second verse by using the line found in Schol. Arr. *Epict.*, IV, 7, 27, p. 422 Schenkl$^2$: ψυχαὶ ἀρηΐφατοι καθαρώτεραι ἢ ἐπὶ νούσοις. However, the supposition that this is a Chaldean verse is unwarranted. The idea that death on the battlefield is superior to death by illness cannot be supported elsewhere as a Chaldean belief. (I am grateful to H.-D. Saffrey for this observation.)

M. Marcovitch (*AJP*, 96, 1975, p. 30) has also found problems with West's emendation. His objection is to ἀρηΐφατοι, which Marcovitch finds redundant after βίῃ. Marcovitch prefers to eliminate ἀρηΐφατοι and keep the ἀνθρώπων of the better class of Psellus' manuscripts. On this last point, I would agree. However, Marcovich would keep the reading καθαρώτεραι and supplement <ἢ ἐνὶ νούσοις> (following West). But this reading still assumes that death by force (whether by suicide or other means)—as preferable to death by natural causes—is a Chaldean tenet. Once again, this is a dubious assumption. Therefore, Kroll's emendation (with Dodds' interpretation) remains the preferred reading of this admittedly problematic bit of verse.

## Fr. 160

**3. θεσμὸν...ἄλυτον**: According to fr. 138, the souls of the theurgists are seemingly exempt from this "law" of transmigration (unless they "choose" to reincarnate). Cf. *C.H.* X.19: οὐδὲ θέμις ἐστὶν εἰς ἀλόγου ζῴου σῶμα ψυχὴν ἀνθρωπίνην καταπεσεῖν. θεοῦ γὰρ νόμος οὗτος φυλάσσειν ψυχὴν ἀνθρωπίνην ἀπὸ τῆς τοσαύτης ὕβρεως. But cf. X.7; 8, where the opposite view is expressed. See Nock-Festugière, *Corpus Hermeticum*, I, notes *ad loc.*; Lewy, p. 222 and n. 190.

**μακάρων**: i.e., the gods. Cf., esp., μάκαρες, fr. 140.

**5. οὐκ ἐπὶ θηρῶν**: Cf., on the other hand, Plotinus, e.g., *Enn.* III.4.2; IV.3.12, who asserts that a soul might be reborn in either animal or vegetable form as a consequence of yielding to its irrational nature. Porphyry (under the influence of the *Oracles*, no doubt) rejected this type of transmigration (see, e.g., *De regressu an.*, p. 38*,10-15, Bidez; Lewy, p. 454, and n. 21). Porphyry, *contra* Plotinus, also seemingly maintained that the soul which had attained the intelligible order (via philosophical purification) would no longer be subject to reincarnation at all. This would also be true of the theurgists; see fr. 138 and notes. But Proclus (following Plotinus) rejected the permanent release of the soul (e.g., *El. Th.*, prop. 206), but with the qualification that certain outstanding souls might spend several world-cycles in the intelligible order (e.g., *In Crat.*, p. 68,10-69,3). See the discussion in Smith, *Porphyry's Place*, p. 56 ff.

## Fr. 161

**1. ποιναὶ μερόπων ἄγκτειραι**: In Psellus' paraphrase: αἱ τιμωρητικαὶ τῶν δαιμόνων φύσεις καὶ βάσκανοι τῶν ἀνθρωπίνων ψυχῶν, ἐνδεσμοῦσι ταύτας τοῖς ὑλικοῖς πάθεσι καὶ οἷον ἀπάγχουσι. Lewy, however (p. 298, n. 151), understands ποιναί as a general, not personified, reference to post-mortem punishments in Hades. But either interpretation is plausible, as the Chaldeans conflate Hades with the Material World. In this regard, cf. *C.H.* I.23, where the "avenging demon" (τιμωρῷ δαίμονι) chastises via τὴν ὀξύτητα τοῦ πυρός (in a post-mortem context) as well as "attacking" αἰσθητικῶς. See Nock-Festugière, *Corpus Hermeticum* I, notes *ad loc.*, for additional parallels in a variety of sources. See, also, notes to τιμωροὺς τῶν ψυχῶν, fr. 90.

## Fr. 162

**1. κατωρύεται**: Lewy (p. 299 and n. 158) cites the "roaring" Erinyes in Eurip., *Iph. Taur.*, 293; Kroll, *loc. cit.*, refers to the "roaring" chasm of Tartarus mentioned in Plato, *Rep.* X, 615 e.

**χθών**: In the context of Psellus, a reference to Hades; i.e., ὁ ὑπὸ γῆν τόπος.

**ἐς τέκνα μέχρις**: Cf. Plato, *Rep.* II, 366 a, where retribution in Hades extends up to the third generation. See Lewy, pp. 298-299 and notes 153-154; Des Places, pp. 182-183, for additional parallels.

## Fr. 163

**2. μηδὲ κάτω νεύσῃς**: Cf. *ibid.*, fr. 164; τὸ κάτω, fr. 34; ἐς τάδε νεύων, fr. 141. Forms of νεύειν are used regularly in both Middle Platonic and Neoplatonic sources to describe the fall of the soul into matter. See, e.g., Lewy, p. 294 and n. 136, for several parallels. Cf., also, Cremer, p. 82 and n. 371; Hadot, *Porphyre* I, p. 185 and n. 5. Occasionally, however, νεύειν also describes the turning of

the soul above. Cf., e.g., Plotinus, *Enn.* IV.4.8.54: πρὸς ἓν ταύτῃ τῇ νεύσει. (Cf., also, VI.6.1.13; 9.9.11.) See, also, Synesius, *Dio*, 45 A; 50 B: ἐπὶ τὰ ἄνω νεῦσαι. See Geudtner, p. 10 and n. 47.

**τὸν μελαναυγέα κόσμον**: Descriptive of matter. Cf. ἐπὶ μισοφαὴ κόσμον, fr. 134; ὁ μισοφαὴς κόσμος, fr. 181; Synesius, *H.* 1(3), 297-300: ψυχά τ' ἀκλινὴς/καὶ κλινομένα (cf. ἐπεγκλίνῃς, fr. 1)/ἐς μελαναυγεῖς/χθονίους ὄγκους. See Lewy, pp. 295-296 and notes 137-138.

*3 + 5.* **βυθός/βάθος**: Here, identified with matter. Cf., e.g., Synesius, *H.* 1(3), 562: ἐς βάθος ὕλας: 2(4), 54-55: βάθη...κόσμου; Psellus, *P.G.*, 122, 1149 c 5: τὴν ὕλην ἣν καλοῦσι βυθόν. Cf., also, βένθεα κοσμοῦ, fr. 148 and notes; Lewy, p. 296, n. 139.

*3.* **ἄμορφος**: Dam.; ἄπιστος, Synesius. The idea of matter as "unformed" or "formless" derives from Plato, *Tim.*, 51 a, where the "Receptacle" (ὑποδοχήν) of the "generated world" is referred to as ἀνόρατον εἶδος τι καὶ ἄμορφον (albeit μεταλαμβάνον τοῦ νοητοῦ). Similarly, in the *Oracles*, matter is also ἄμορφος (albeit πατρογενές; see Psellus, *Hypotyp.*, 27). For Plotinus, both the One and matter are similarly "unformed;" however, with Plotinus, the One is understood as being beyond form, whereas matter, in contrast, is devoid of form (and, consequently, needs to be informed). In this regard, cf. fr. 100, where matter is described as αὐχμηράν. See, also, fr. 18 and notes, and discussion in Introduction.

**ἀειδής**: Synesius, *loc. cit.*, reads ᾅδης here, but Terzaghi has emended the text to ἀειδής, based on Damascius' manuscript. (Terzaghi evidently misread Kroll here and therefore mistakenly attributed the line to Psellus.) The etymology Hades = Unseen, is based on Plato; e.g., *Gorg.*, 493 b: ὡς τῶν ἐν Ἅιδου—τὸ ἀϊδὲς δὴ λέγων. Cf. *Phaedo*, 80 d; *Crat.*, 403 a. See, also, Lewy, p. 296, n. 142.

*4.* **ἀμφικνεφής**: Synonymous with μελαναυγέα, *supra*.

ῥυπόων: According to Lewy (p. 298, n. 148), descriptive of the "filth" of the Underworld where, especially, the sinners of Orphic teaching were doomed to suffer.

**εἰδωλοχαρής**: In the context of Synesius, this term is equated with the (ὄχ-ημα)πνεῦμα. (Cf., in this sense, εἰδώλῳ, fr. 158 and notes.) For Synesius, these three verses describe the descent of τὸ νοερὸν σπέρμα (= "spark of soul," "flower/flame of mind") into matter. Cf., also, *H.* 1(3), 90-94: δαίμων ὕλας,/νεφέλα ψυχᾶς,/εἰδωλοχαρής,/εὐχαῖς σκύλακας/ἐπιθωὺσσω. Des Places (p. 146, following Keydell, 1941) suggests that this term is descriptive of the "insubstantiality of matter;" Lewy (p. 297) sees an allusion to the "shades" of Hades.

**ἀνόητος**: Matter, as the antithesis of the intelligible world, is necessarily "without reason." Cf., e.g., fr. 156, where the "demons" or "dogs" of matter are similarly described as ἀλόγων.

*5.* **κρημνώδης**: Cf. κρημνῷ, fr. 158; κρημνός, fr. 164.

σκολιός: Cf. σκολιοῖσι, fr. 172; *C.H.* I.4: σκότος (= matter)...σκολιῶς ἐσπειραμένον, ὡς <ὄφει>. See Nock-Festugière, *Corpus Hermeticum* I, notes *ad loc.* Lewy (p. 297, n. 147) sees a further allusion to the sinuous rivers of the Underworld.

**πηρὸν βάθος αἰὲν ἐλίσσων**: Cf. Numenius, fr. 3 (Des Places): ποταμὸς γὰρ ἡ ὕλη ῥοώδης καὶ ὀξύρροπος, βάθος καὶ πλάτος καὶ μῆκος ἀόριστος καὶ ἀνήνυτος. See Lewy, p. 296, n. 143.

*6.* **νυμφεύων ἀφανὲς δέμας**: According to Lewy (p. 297, n. 145), this image is developed from those passages in Plato's *Timaeus*, e.g., 50 d; 51 a (see *supra*); 52 d, where matter is connected with female generation.

**ἀργόν**: Cf. ἀργῷ, fr. 94.

## Fr. 164

**1. μηδὲ κάτω νεύσῃς**: Cf. *ibid.*, fr. 163.

**κρημνός**: Cf. κρημνῷ, fr. 158; κρημνώδης, fr. 163. See, also, Hadot, *Porphyre*, I, p. 84, n. 4, who cites several parallels in various Latin sources.

**2. ἑπταπόρου...κατὰ βαθμίδος**: In the context of Psellus, a reference to the seven planets through which the soul makes its descent to earth. Lewy, however, translates "sevenfold ladder" (see pp. 294 and n. 133; 414 and n. 50) and sees a similarity to the κλῖμαξ ἑπτάπυλος of the Mithraic mysteries (and so Dodds, "New Light," p. 272 = Lewy$^2$, pp. 700-701.) But Lewy adds (p. 414): "Whether the Oracles use this figure only as a metaphorical description of an intellectual ascent to the apprehension of the noetic world, or whether they refer thereby to a specific practice in the celebration of the mystery, which was acted out apart from the 'elevation' to the sun can no longer be known. It is not impossible that the ascent to the supramundane (the 'eighth' zone) formed the initiation of the highest class of initiates, to whose souls the final translation into the Empyrean was promised." In this latter regard, cf. *C.H.* XIII.9; *Disc. 8-9*, NHC VI, 52,13; 54,28; 63,9, where forms of βαθμός refer to the various spiritual "stages" or "degrees" of the ascent process, the final stage that of ascent to the "ninth."

**σύρων**: Common to the *Oracles* in various contexts. Cf. frr. 34, 63, 70.

## Fr. 165

**1. ζήτησον παράδεισον**: Although Psellus cites this fragment as part of an oracular verse (and so Des Places), it is most likely a part of Psellus' commentary on fr. 107, v. 10. (See Kroll, *loc. cit.*; Lewy, p. 221, n. 178; Tardieu, Lewy$^2$, p. 680.) In conjunction with fr. 107, Lewy (p. 220 ff.) locates the Chaldean "paradise" at the level of the World Soul. Psellus, however, situates "paradise" at the level of the Highest God in terms of the "chorus of divine powers" which surrounds this god. Psellus, *P.G.*, 122, 1129 b, also identifies the Chaldean "paradise" with the Homeric Elysian Fields (as a "meadow"), but for Psellus, this is clearly a "noetic" meadow: ὁ λειμὼν τῶν ὑψηλοτέρων θεωριῶν. In this latter regard, cf. Synesius, *H.* 1(3), 687 ff., where it is the "meadow" (λειμῶνα) of the Father where Synesius yearns to go in order to join the "kingly choir" (σὺν ἄνακτι χορῷ) in "intellectual hymns" (νοεροὺς ὕμνους). Similarly, in *C.H.* I.26, the elevated soul—at the "eighth" level of ascent—joins in hymns of praise with the various powers surrounding the Father: καὶ ὁμοιωθεὶς τοῖς συνοῦσιν ἀκούει καί τινων δυνάμενων ὑπὲρ τὴν ὀγδοατικὴν φύσιν φωνῇ τινι ἡδείᾳ ὑμνουσῶν τὸν θεόν. Cf. *Disc. 8-9*, NHC VI, 59,28-32: ⲁⲩⲱ ϯⲛⲁⲩ ⲉⲑⲟⲩⲇⲟⲁⲥ ⲙⲛ̄ ⲛ̄ⲯⲩⲭⲏ ⲉⲧⲛ̄ⲥⲏⲧⲥ̄ ⲙⲛ̄ ⲛ̄ⲁⲅⲅⲉⲗⲟⲥ ⲉⲩⲣ̄ⲭⲩⲙⲛⲉⲓ ⲉⲑⲉⲛⲛⲁⲥ ⲙⲛ̄ ⲛⲉⲥⲇⲩⲛⲁⲙⲓⲥ. In light of this evidence, it is probable that the Chaldean "paradise" was understood in Psellus' sense; i.e., as a "choir of divine powers" which praise the Father with hymns.

**2-3. τὰ ἐμπύρια κάλλη τῶν δημιουργικῶν πηγῶν**: An allusion to the Ideas. Cf. κάλλη ἄφραστα, fr. 108 and notes; πηγαῖς, fr. 49 and notes.

## Fr. 166

**1-2. μὴ 'ξάξῃς, ἵνα μή τι ἔχουσα/ἐξίῃ**: Tardieu (Lewy$^2$, p. 680) does not accept this fragment as authentic, but regards it as a Porphyrian oracle which has

been conflated with Plotinus, *Enn.* I.9: οὐκ ἐξάξεις, ἵνα μὴ ἐξίῃ· ἐξελεύσεται γὰρ ἔχουσα τι...Kroll, *loc. cit.*, also denies the fragment's authenticity, assigning it a Pythagorean origin. In this regard, cf. Dodds ("Theurgy," 1947, p. 57, n. 26a = 1957, pp. 301-302, n. 26), who points out that the "fragment cannot come from a hexameter poem. The doctrine is Pythagorean." Lewy (p. 474) also denies the fragment's authenticity, arguing that Psellus misread his source (Proclus) at this point. According to Lewy, Proclus' attribution was to the Orphic not Chaldean tradition (the confusion resulting from the common use of the term θεολόγοι). Des Places, however (p. 165, following Psellus), accepts the fragment as authentic, but notes that this would be the only instance in the *Enneads* where Plotinus cites the *Oracles*. Finamore, (*Iamblichus and the Theory of the Vehicle of the Soul,* p. 8, n. 10) also argues for the fragment's authenticity, suggesting that Plotinus may well have become acquainted with "Chaldean beliefs" through his students and would not have found this particular bit of verse objectionable. But this is conjectural, as we simply have no direct evidence that Plotinus was familiar with the *Oracles*. (See notes to fr. 155 in this regard.) In addition, Des Places also admits that the meter is difficult, even with his transposition τι ἔχουσα (codd.: ἔχουσά τι). The best evidence, then, is that the fragment is not Chaldean in origin.

## Fr. 167

My translation of this fragment and introductory material is a slightly revised version of that of Morrow, p. 123.

**4. κέντρον**: In the context of Proclus, it is a matter of the "mathematical center" which "typifies" πασῶν ἀρχηγὸν τῶν πεπληθυσμένων προόδων. In this sense, cf. fr. 189, where Proclus alludes to the World Soul ( = Hecate) as containing τὸ κέντρον τῆς προόδου τῶν ὄντων ἁπάντων ἐν ἑαυτῇ. Elsewhere in the *Oracles* (see fr. 50 and notes), Hecate is also referred to as κέντρον. (In frr. 70 and 111, however, κέντρον refers to the central position of the sun.) But Lewy (p. 97, n. 130) connects this fragment with the introductory material to fr. 65 and thus understands κέντρον here as a reference to the earth. Similarly, Lewy understands κέντρον in fr. 70 as referring to the earth. In both cases, however, Lewy contradicts what he is aware of elsewhere; that it is the sun, not the earth, which occupies the central position in Chaldean cosmology.

**ἄντυγος**: For Proclus, this term is equated with τὴν περιφέρειαν ("circumference") in a mathematical context. Thus, for Proclus, πᾶσαι ἴσαι would refer to τὰς γραμμάς (l. 2). Lewy, however, would equate ἄντυγος (in a Chaldean context) with the "vault" of heaven. For Lewy, then, the fragment as a whole describes the "central" position of the earth around which the planetary spheres (Lewy would supply αἱ σφαῖραι as a subject) are "equally" (πᾶσαι ἴσαι) situated "up to the vault" (of heaven). But again, this interpretation contradicts the "sun as center" cosmology of the Chaldean system. In addition, the term ἄντυγος here may not allude to the heavenly "vault" but to the "orbits" of the planetary spheres. In this regard, cf. Proclus, *H.* II.17: εἴτε καὶ ἑπτὰ κύκλων ὑπὲρ ἄντυγας αἰθερὶ ναίεις (sc. Aphrodite). Although the fragment undoubtedly has a cosmological context, its precise meaning remains problematic.

## Fr. 168

**1. (Ἀπόλλων)**: Cf. fr. 71, where Apollo is similarly identified with the sun.

**τὰς ἡλιακὰς ἀρχάς**: Descriptive of the Ideas. Cf. Psellus, *Hypotyp.* 12: καὶ ἡ τοῦ ἡλίου πηγὴ πρὸ τῶν ἡλιακῶν ἀρχῶν ἱδρυμένη· ἔστι γὰρ τῶν μὲν ἡλιακῶν ἀρχῶν ὁ δημιουργὸς αἴτιος...ἀπὸ δὲ τῆς ἡλιακῆς πηγῆς <ὁ> ἀρχικὸς ἥλιος προέρχεται καὶ ὁ ἀρχαγγελικός. But, as Lewy notes (p. 150 and n. 309), the triadic hierarchy of πηγαί, ἀρχαί, ἀρχαγγελοί (although based on Chaldean categories) is a Proclan development.

**2. κατέχων τὴν τρίπτερον ἀρχήν**: Cf. Proclus, *In Tim.*, III, 62,6-9: εἰ δέ τινες ταῖς τῶν μαθηματικῶν ὑποθέσεσι χαίροντες μέσον τῶν ἑπτὰ πλανήτων τάττειν ἀξιοῖεν τὸν ἥλιον, συνάγοντα καὶ συνδέοντα τὰς ἐφ' ἑκάτερα αὐτοῦ τριάδας. Thus, as Lewy notes (*ibid.*), the fragment apparently alludes to the central position of the sun surrounded on each side by three planets (cf. fr. 200 in this regard.) However, cf. fr. 8, where κατέχειν is used with reference to τὰ νοητά (= the Ideas) contained in the Demiurgic Intellect. Since the Ideas, as a whole, were conceived triadically in the Chaldean system (cf. the "measurable triad" of fr. 23; see, also, fr. 31 and notes), the fragment may well be a further reflection of this idea.

## Fr. 169

**2. ἅπαξ ἐπέκεινα**: "Once Transcendent" applies to the Supreme God or First Intellect who is monadic in nature (cf. πατρικὴ μονάς, fr. 11). In the context of Proclus, this Highest God is also described as ἀμιστύλλευτος, ἑνοειδής, ἀδιαίρετος (cf. fr. 152), and πασῶν συνοχεὺς τῶν πηγῶν (cf. fr. 207). In addition, Proclus identifies ὁ ἅπαξ ἐπέκεινα with Kronos. As an indivisible unity, ὁ ἅπαξ ἐπέκεινα is to be distinguished from ὁ δὶς ἐπέκεινα (or "Twice Transcendent" = Second Intellect), who is dyadic in nature: e.g., *In Crat.*, 52, 1-3: καὶ τί δεῖ λέγειν; αὐτόθεν γὰρ αὐτόν προσαγορεύει δὶς ἐπέκεινα καὶ δὶς ἐκεῖ, καὶ ὅλως αὐτὸν διὰ τῆς δυάδος εὐφημεῖ. Cf. δυάς, fr. 8 and notes. See, also, Lewy, p. 77 and n. 43; Hadot, *Porphyre*, I, p. 262 and notes 2-3; Des Places, *testimonia*, p. 107, for additional parallels. Elsewhere, Proclus equates ὁ ἅπαξ ἐπέκεινα and ὁ δὶς ἐπέκεινα with the names "Ad" and "Adad" (see *In Parm.* VII, ed. C. Steel, p. 512, 1-7 = Kl.-Lab., p. 60, 1-9. "Adad" is an apparent corruption of the Syrian "Haddad.") As Dodds notes ("New Light," p. 272 = Lewy$^2$, p. 701), "Ad" (as an "invented name") would correspond to ἅπαξ, whereas "Ad" + "Ad" (or "Adad") would correspond to δὶς (ἐπέκεινα). (See, also, Theiler, 1942, p. 6 = 1966, p. 258.) Of further interest is Porphyry's identification of the δὶς ἐπέκεινα with the God of the Jews: ὁ μέντοι Πορφύριος ἐν τῷ ὑπομνήματι τῶν λογίων τὸν δὶς ἐπέκεινα τουτέστι τὸν τῶν ὅλων δημιουργὸν τὸν παρὰ Ἰουδαίοις τιμώμενον εἶναι ἀξιοῖ, ὃν ὁ Χαλδαῖος δεύτερον ἀπὸ τοῦ ἅπαξ ἐπέκεινα, τουτέστι τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ, θεολογεῖ (as cited by Lydus, *De mens.*, IV, 53; p. 110, 18-22 W.). But whether this citation derives from Porphyry's *De philos. ex or. haur.*, or from another Porphyrian work, is much debated. On this problem, see Lewy, p. 9 and notes 23-24; Bidez, *Vie de Porphyre*, p. 70*, no. 50; Dodds, "New Light," p. 267 = Lewy$^2$, pp. 696-697; Hadot, *Porphyre*, I, p. 264, n. 6.

## Fr. 170

**1. πνεῦματος...ἀπὸ τῶν ὑπογείων τόπων**: The notion that subterranean winds were the cause of earthquakes was common in Antiquity. See, e.g., Proclus, *In Tim.*, I, 188, 1-12; Festugière, *Tim.*, I, p. 245, n. 2; Lewy, p. 259, n. 2. For the later Neoplatonists, these "winds" became identified with subterranean demons. Cf. the χθόνιοι κύνες of fr. 90; Marinus, *Vita Procli*, 28.

**3. αὐτάνδρους πόλεάς γ' ἀπολέσθαι**: Elsewhere, similar "apocalyptic" visions are explicitly said to be the work of demons. See, e.g., *C.H.* XVI.10; *Asclepius*, 25-26; *Kore Kosmou*, 53; 67; Porphyry, *De abst.*, II.40.

## Fr. 171

**2. μηδέ ποτ' ἐκ λήθης ῥεύσωμεν κτλ.**: Although this verse has been reconstructed by Theiler (1942, p. 32, n. 1 = 1966, p. 290, n. 127; codd.: μὴ ταπεινὸν ἐκ λήθης ῥεύσωμεν χεῦμα), its Chaldean origin remains problematic (and so Tardieu, Lewy$^2$, p. 680.) Lewy, p. 493, conjectures that the line has been placed here by Psellus from another passage. The vocabulary, however, fits a Chaldean context.

**ἐκ λήθης**: An allusion to the "forgetfulness" of the soul after its "fall" into matter. Cf. λήθης, fr. 109 and notes.

**ῥεύσωμεν**: Cf., esp., ῥευστόν, fr. 128; ῥευστά, fr. 134. See, also, ῥοή, fr. 56 and notes for additional parallels to this familiar term.

**χεῦμα**: Cf. πολυχεύμονα φῦλα, fr. 93 and notes.

## Fr. 172

**1-2. (τῆς ὕλης) ἧς κατασύρονται πολλοὶ σκολιοῖσι ῥεέθροις**: This line has been tentatively reconstructed by Lewy (p. 303, n. 170, and so Des Places). Kroll, however, *loc. cit.*, identified only σκολιὰ ῥεῖθρα (of Proclus' text) as derived from a Chaldean verse. In this regard, cf. Proclus, *In Crat.*, 104, 6: τῶν τε σκολιῶν ἁτραπῶν τῆς ὕλης ἀναρπάζουσα. See, also, Festugière, *Tim.*, V, p. 208 and n. 1, who cites Kroll, but does not mention Lewy's reconstruction. Thus, Lewy's restoration of the verse must remain in doubt (and so Tardieu, Lewy$^2$, p. 680.)

**1. τὸ λάβρον τῆς ὕλης**: See fr. 134 and notes.

**2. κατασύρονται**: Cf., esp., κατασύρων, fr. 70.

**πολλοί**: Equivalent to the "herd" of frr. 153 and 154.

**σκολιοῖσι**: Cf. σκολιός, fr. 163; Synesius, *H.* 1(3), 261-265: σκολιᾶς δ' ἀπάτας/ἀνέχεις ὁσίων/πραπίδας μερόπων,/ἐς ζόφον ὕλας/μὴ καταδῦναι. See Theiler, 1942, p. 11, n. 4 = 1966, p. 265, n. 38.

**ῥεέθροις**: Cf., esp., ῥευσῶμεν, fr. 171 and notes.

## Fr. 173

**2. τὴν πρωτογενῆ ὕλην**: Tardieu (Lewy$^2$, p. 680, following Kroll, *loc. cit.*) thinks this fragment is Orphic, not Chaldean, in origin. Cf., in this regard, Olympiodorus, *In Alc.*, 15 [19,6-7 Cr.] W.: φησὶ γὰρ καὶ ὁ Ὀρφεύς· ὕλης οὐρανίης καὶ ἀστερίης καὶ ἀβύσσου (see *infra*). Although Aphrodite (l. 1) does not figure elsewhere in the *Oracles*, Proclus, *H.* II (εἰς Ἀφροδίτην) identifies Aphrodite with the World Soul (in the manner of Hecate). This hymn as a whole (although modeled

on *Orphic Hymn* 55: εἰς Ἀφροδίτην) reflects a conflation of Orphic and Chaldean terminologies. However, in neither Proclus' hymn nor the Orphic hymn to Aphrodite is the goddess referred to as ἡ πρωτογενὲς ὕλη. Thus, the actual source of our fragment remains in doubt.

3. ἀστερίαν καὶ οὐρανίαν: Cf. fr. 216, where Lydus again attributes these terms to the *Oracles*, but Olympiodorus (see *supra*) to Orpheus.

## Fr. 174

Tardieu (Lewy$^2$, p. 680) identifies this fragment as Orphic; Des Places (p. 108), however, sees a possible Chaldean origin because of Hermias' use of the formulaic φησὶ τὰ λόγια. For Des Places, then, the fragment—in a Chaldean context—refers to the activity of Hecate as World Soul. (Kroll does not mention this fragment at all. Lewy, p. 356, n. 168, mentions this line in passing, but only as a commentary on the self-moved soul of Plato, *Phaedrus*, 245 c, and not as a Chaldean hexameter.) In addition, the vocabulary of this line reflects no particular Chaldean "stamp." Thus, the actual source of this fragment must remain in doubt.

## Fr. 175

1. περὶ τοῦ πρωτίστου πατρός: In the context of Proclus, this expression designates the Highest God under the mode of σιγή. In this regard, cf. τῇ θεοθρέμμονι σιγῇ τῶν πατέρων, fr. 16.

2. δύναμιν πρώτην ἱεροῦ λόγου: For Proclus, descriptive of the Father before he is actualized as λόγος or Word. In this sense, δύναμις here would correspond to the second movement of the Primordial Triad (i.e., Father, Power, Intellect = Word). Cf. fr. 4 and notes; Proclus, *In Tim.*, III, 222, 13-14: διαδέχεται γὰρ τὴν...πατρικὴν σιγὴν ὁ δημιουργικὸς λόγος. Hadot (*Porphyre*, I, p. 295, n. 1) notes M. Victorinus' similar use of "silentium-verbum" in *Adv. Ar.*, III. 7.28-29 (cf. I. 13.31; 41.49), but suggests that these passages most likely reflect a conflation of Christian and Chaldean imageries. (In this regard, cf. Synesius' use of πατήρ-λόγος in *H.* 2(4), 129-140.) In a Chaldean context, Lewy (p. 112, n. 181) suggests that the fragment "possibly refers to the relationship between the intellection of the formation of the world and its realization" and sees a parallel with fr. 212. (Metrically, Lewy, *ibid.*, would reconstruct the verse as: ἠδὲ λόγου ἱεροῦ πρωτὴν δύναμιν...) See, also, Kroll, *loc. cit.*, who sees a possible allusion to the Iynges as πατρικαὶ δυνάμεις.

## Fr. 176

2. ὑπερβάθμιον πόδα ῥιπτῶν: "To throw the feet beneath the step" is *not* to follow the proper order (τάξις) of ritual initiation. Cf. frr. 110, 136, 164 and notes; Marinus, *Vita Procli*, 13: ἐν τάξει καὶ οὐχ ὑπερβάθμον ποδά, κατὰ τὸ λόγιον, τείνοντα. See Lewy, p. 262, n. 10, for additional parallels to this expression.

## Fr. 177

3-4. οἱ μὲν τελετάρχαι κτλ.: Tardieu (Lewy$^2$, p. 680) considers the vocabulary of this fragment Chaldean, but questions Des Places' reconstruction of the meter. Neither Kroll (*loc. cit.*) nor Lewy (p. 155, n. 334) attempted to isolate a hexameter from Damascius' prose.

3. οἱ τελετάρχαι: The rulers of the three worlds; cf. fr. 86 and notes.

4. τοῖς συνοχεῦσι: The "Connectors" of the various parts of the Universe; cf. fr. 32 and notes. In Damascius' system (following Proclus), the Teletarchs and Connectors (as well as Iynges) are situated in the "median" intelligible-and-intellectual order.

## Fr. 178

2. ἀβατοῖς σηκοῖς (τῆς) διανοίας: Des Places (p. 109, following Diehl) identifies these words as Chaldean (and translates "de *la* pensée"). Lewy (p. 99, n. 138) notes only that these words might "allude" to a "Chaldean phrase." Festugière, however (*Tim.*, IV, p. 31 and n. 4), prefers to translate these words as part of Proclus' commentary ("de *ma* pensée"). Tardieu (Lewy$^2$, p. 680) is of the same opinion. In the context of Proclus, these terms sum up his comments on Aion (see fr. 49), but do not, therefore, demand a Chaldean origin. Forms of ἄβατος, e.g., are used elsewhere by Proclus, but not in any explicit Chaldean context. Cf., e.g., *Th. pl.*, I.3; p. 14, 6 S.-W. Saffrey and Westerink, notes *ad loc.*, point out that ἄβατος is a "metaphoric expression" which comprises part of the vocabulary of Neoplatonic "negative theology." Cf., also, *Th. pl.*, I.11; p. 55, 5 S.-W.; I.20; p. 95, 23 S.-W.; *In rem p.*, I. 78, 31; *In Alc.*, 149 [319,14 Cr.] W.

## Fr. 179

1. τὴν νοητήν: Analogous to τι νοητόν, fr. 1.

2. τμήσιος: In Lewy's interpretation (pp. 106-107 and n. 168), it is the cooperation of the Father's Intellect, Will, and Power which brings about the initial "division" of the intelligible world into triads. Cf. νοεραῖς τομαῖσιν, fr. 1; τέμνεσθαι, fr. 22.

(τὸ)...ἄρχειν: Cf., esp., πατρικῆς ἀρχῆς, fr. 13.

## Frr. 180 and 181

Des Places has isolated the words that comprise these two fragments from Proclus, *In Tim.*, III, 325, 29-326, 1 (see fr. 172). Since these terms simply repeat the terminology of fr. 134, v. 1, Tardieu (Lewy$^2$, p. 680) rightly suggests that they should be excised here.

## Fr. 182

1. (τῇ μέσῃ τάξει τῶν νοερῶν): See Lewy, Exc. VII, p. 484. This particular τάξις would be equivalent to Hecate as ἡ ζωογόνος θεά.

1-2. ἥ τε ἀρετὴ καὶ ἡ σοφία: Cf. fr. 52, where ἀρετή is said to reside in Hecate. In fr. 107, ἀρετή and σοφία are mentioned together in connection with εὐνομία as planetary virtues.

3. ἡ πολύφρων ἀτρεκεία: Lewy (p. 50 and n. 160) translates this expression as "thoughtful truth," and notes that ἀτρεκεία is the epic equivalent of ἀλήθεια. This latter term is found elsewhere in the *Oracles* in connection with πίστις and ἔρως (see fr. 46 and notes). πολύφρων, of course, is Homer's epithet for both Odysseus (e.g., *Od.* 14. 424) and Hephaestus (e.g., *Od.* 8. 297). Chaignet

(*Damascius*, II, p. 208) translates the fragment as "la vérité avec ses pensées multiples." Des Places (p. 110) prefers "la rectitude ingénieuse." Cf., also, Synesius, *H.* 1(3), 156: ἀτρέκεια σοφά.

## Fr. 183

**2. τὸ δ' ἀτρεκὲς ἐν βαθεῖ ἐστι**: Tardieu (Lewy$^2$, p. 680) identifies this fragment as a precept from Democritus and, therefore, not Chaldean in origin. The same suggestion is made by Cremer (p. 56, n. 152), who specifically cites Democritus, fr. 117 (Diels): ἐν βυθῷ γὰρ ἡ ἀλήθεια. Lewy (p. 146, n. 293) was apparently unaware of the Democritean parallel and assumed the fragment was authentically Chaldean. Des Places (p. 110) remains uncertain. Although the source of the fragment is probably Democritus, this does not then preclude that the Chaldeans may have "borrowed" this fragment for their own purposes. The vocabulary certainly fits a Chaldean milieu.

**τὸ ἀτρεκές**: Cf. ἀτρεκεία, fr. 182.

**ἐν βαθεῖ**: Cf. βάθει, fr. 184; βυθόν, fr. 18; βυθός/βάθος, fr. 163.

## Fr. 184

**1. ὁ ἡλιακὸς κόσμος**: In the context of Psellus, this expression refers to the mundane sun of the Ethereal World and not to the transmundane sun or "whole light" of Asion as Lewy suggests (see p. 151 and n. 313; cf. fr. 59 and notes). Lewy mistakenly understands Psellus to mean that ὁ ἡλιακὸς κόσμος is situated *above* the fixed stars (and, thus, in the Empyrean World). But Psellus simply does not make this distinction. Indeed, he suggests just the opposite, by describing—in descending order—the "chain" of Chaldean realities, placing ὁ ἡλιακὸς κόσμος *after* ὁ ἀπλανὴς **κύκλος** (and so *beneath*, not above, the fixed stars).

**2. δουλεύων** βάθει **αἰθερίῳ**: Cf. Proclus, *Th. pl.*, II.7; p. 45, 9-11 S.-W.: τὸν ἥλιον...ἀπὸ τῶν αἰθερίων προελθόντα βυθῶν. But in what sense the "solar world" or mundane sun "serves the ethereal depth" is problematic. Forms of δουλεύειν are common to the *Oracles*, but in other contexts; e.g., frr. 73, 80, 81.

## Fr. 185

**1. ὁ ἀληθέστερος ἥλιος**: An allusion to the transmundane sun (or Aion). See Lewy, p. 152, n. 314; cf. fr. 59 and notes.

**2. χρόνου χρόνος**: The inference here is that the "truer sun" (or Aion) functions as the source of Time. But to what extent Chronos, as a god, was distinguished from Aion in the Chaldean system remains problematic. See, esp., notes to ἀκοιμήτου χρόνου, fr. 37. Cf., also, Proclus, *El. Th.*, prop. 53: ὁ μὲν αἰὼν αἰώνων, ὁ δὲ χρόνων χρόνος; Synesius, *H.* 5(2), 67: σὺ δ' ἄναξ αἰῶνος αἰών; *PGM* IV. 2197-2198: ὁ τῶν ὅλων Δεσπότης, ὁ αἰὼν τῶν αἰώνων. See, also, Dodds, *Proclus*: *El. Th.*, p. 228 ff.

## Fr. 186

**2. ῥόθιον**: i.e., the state of flux associated with corporeality. Cf. ῥευστὸν σῶμα, fr. 128.

**κύτος**: i.e., the human body. See Lewy (p. 277 and n. 72), who cites Plato, *Tim.*, 44 a, as the *locus classicus*: τὸ τῆς ψυχῆς ἅπαν κύτος. Cf., analogously, ἀγγεῖον, fr. 157.

### Fr. 186 *bis*

**2. πάμμορφον ἄγαλμα**: This expression reflects the vocabulary of frr. 37 (παμμόρφους ἰδέας) and 101 (αὔτοπτον ἄγαλμα). For Olympiodorus (cf. *ibid.*, 157 [68,23 N.] W.), the expression refers to the individual soul which contains all of the "Principles" ( = Forms) of existence. For this notion, cf., e.g., Plotinus, *Enn.*, IV.3.10.10-13; V.7.1.7-8; VI.2.5.11-14; Proclus, *El. Th.*, prop. 195 (as cited by Westerink, *loc. cit.*, *ad not.*). The precise Chaldean application of this expression, however, is uncertain.

## VARIOUS CHALDEAN EXPRESSIONS

### Fr. 187

**1. ἀγήρων**: Although Proclus associates this term both with the Orphic and Chaldean traditions, this term may properly be Orphic in origin (and so Tardieu, Lewy$^2$, p. 680, *contra* Lewy, p. 79, n. 48). Cf., in this regard, *Orph. Fr.* 54 (Kern): χρόνος ἀγήραος. For Proclus, the "order" (τάξις) associated with ἀγήρων is that of Kronos ( = ἄπαξ ἐπέκεινα; see fr. 169). Cf., also, Synesius, *H.* 8(9), 67, where ἀγήραος is descriptive of Αἰών. Elsewhere, Synesius uses forms of ἀγήραος in a variety of contexts; e.g., *H.* 1(3), 344, 480; 2(4), 152; 5(2), 45. Although Synesius is primarily dependent on the *Oracles*, his use of this term may reflect a conflation of Orphic and Chaldean material (mediated, perhaps, through Porphyry).

### Fr. 188

Tardieu (Lewy$^2$, p. 680) wants to excise this fragment (as well as frr. 195, 199, 200) on the basis that these terms are derived from the prose works of Julian the Theurgist rather than from the *Oracles*. However, inclusion of these terms (although methodologically problematic) does enhance our understanding of the Chaldean system as a whole.

**1. τοῖς Ἀσσυρίοις**: A circumlocution for the Chaldean tradition. See Lewy, Exc. I, p. 444 c.

**ζῶναι καὶ ἄζωνοι**: These are "Time" gods associated with the planetary spheres—the ζῶναι (or ζωναῖοι; cf. fr. 195) dependent on the planetary orbits, the ἄζωνοι independent of these movements. Cf. Synesius, *H.* 1(3), 282-283: οἳ ζωναῖοι/οἵ τ' ἄζωνοι. Psellus *Hypotyp.*, 18, situates these Time deities just below the Archangels in the Chaldean "chain." In addition, the Chaldeans also recognized other Time gods associated with Day, Night, Month, and Year, all of which were invoked by various τελεσταί. See, e.g., Proclus, *In Tim.*, III, 40, 31-41, 5. See, also, Festugière, *Tim.*, IV, pp. 45, n. 1; 64, n. 1; Lewy, p. 137 and n. 267.

**πηγαί**: Cf. frr. 30, 37, 49, 56.

**ἀμείλικτοι**: Cf. frr. 35, 36.

**2. συνοχεῖς**: Cf. frr. 32, 80, 82, 177, 207.

## Fr. 189

1. **ἀμφιφαής**: Here, descriptive of Hecate who, as Kroll notes (p. 27, n. 2), traditionally held torches in either hand. For the later Neoplatonists, however, this expression has become a metaphysical term. Cf., in this regard, ἀμφιφαοῦς, fr. 1; ἀμφιφάοντα, fr. 158. See, also, Damascius, I, 315, 20; II, 152, 23: ἀμφιφαὴς Ἑκάτη.

**ἀμφιπρόσωπος**: This term is also descriptive of Hecate who, as the mediating World Soul, has a "double" aspect, viz. she looks both towards the intelligible and sensible orders. Traditionally, statues of Hecate were depicted with three or four heads and known as τριπρόσωπος or τετραπρόσωπος. See Lewy, pp. 93 and n. 111; 355 and notes 164-166, who notes that ἀμφιπρόσωπος was a term also used by Plutarch (e.g., *Num.* 19) to describe Ianus Bifrons. In this regard, note that Proclus addresses *Hymn* VI in common to Hecate and Janus. See, also, Festugière, *Tim.*, III, p. 170, n. 1.

**κόλποις**: Common to the *Oracles*. Cf. esp., Ἑκάτης κόλπον, fr. 32; πρηστηροδόχοι κόλποι...Ἑκάτης, fr. 35; Ῥείη...κόλποισιν ἀφράστοις...δεξαμένη, fr. 56.

2. **ὀχετούς**: Cf. frr. 2, 65, 66, 110.

3. **τὸ κέντρον**: Cf., esp., Ἑκάτης κέντρον, fr. 50; κέντρον, fr. 167 and notes.

## Fr. 190

2. **αὐτοψίαι**: Cf. αὔτοπτον ἄγαλμα, fr. 101; αὐτόπτοις φάσμασιν, fr. 142.

3-4. **τοὺς πυρσοὺς ἀνάπτουσαι τοὺς ἀναγωγούς**: Although these terms do not constitute a hexameter verse, it is probable that forms of ἀναγωγός in connection with "fire/light" did figure in non-extant verses of the *Oracles*. In this regard, cf. Proclus, *H.* IV.2: ἀναγώγιον ἀψάμενοι πῦρ; III.1: ἀναγώγιον φῶς; Synesius, *H.* 1(3), 376, 594, 699: ἀναγωγὰ φάη. Cf., also, πυρσὸν ἀνάψασα, fr. 126; πυρσοὺς ἀκμαίους, fr. 130. (See, also, Lewy, p. 261, n. 7e.) Tardieu, however (Lewy$^2$, p. 680), feels that Des Places' isolation of ἀναγωγός as a specific *vox Chaldaicorum* is unwarranted, as this term is also familiar to Platonism. See discussion in Introduction.

## Fr. 191

1. **περὶ ἐκείνων**: In the context of Proclus, a reference to τὰ πρὸ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ. See fr. 132, which is a continuation of this statement.

**ἀφθέγκτων**: Cf. βουλαῖς ἀφθέγκτοις, fr. 77; Bidez, *C.M.A.G.* VI, p. 163,9 (as cited by Lewy, p. 77, n. 38): Χαλδαῖοι ἕν φασιν τὸ πρώτον αἴτιον, ὃ δὴ καὶ ἀφθεγκτότατον λέγουσιν. The "ineffableness" of the intelligible order, especially that of the Highest God, is common to Middle Platonism. Cf., e.g., *C.H.* I.31; *Tri. Trac.*, NHC I, 56,3, 27; 123,37; *Zost.*, NHC VIII, 74,21; 126,10; *Val. Ex.*, NHC XI, 22,[20]; 24,39; 29,31-31. See Lewy, p. 328, n. 59 for additional parallels. But whether the Chaldeans used the term "One" for the First God is problematic; see notes to frr. 9 and 10.

## Fr. 192

1. **ἔνυλος**: Although Simplicus further identifies this term as Platonic, the *locus classicus* is Arist., *De an.*, 403 A 25. Cf. fr. 69 and notes re the "materiality" of the sky.

## Fr. 193

**1. αἱ ψυχαὶ (ὑπερκοσμίοι)**: For Proclus, these "supermundane souls" μέσαι νόων εἰσὶ καὶ τῶν ἐγκοσμίων ψυχῶν.

**2. ἐποχεῖσθαι**: Cf. ἐποχούμενος, fr. 36 and notes. The sense of "being vehicled" approaches the notion of the ὄχημα-πνεῦμα. See frr. 120 and 201.

**1-2. σώμασιν...ὑπερκοσμίοις τισὶν, αἰθερίοις καὶ ἐμπυρίοις**: Proclus' language is ambiguous here and may reflect a confusion between the seven planetary spheres and three world circles. Cf. *In Tim.*, II, 57, 12-14: τὰ ὑπὲρ τὸν κόσμον στερεώματα τί φήσομεν, εἴτε Ὄλυμπον χρὴ καλεῖν, εἴτε ἐμπύριον, εἴτε αἰθέρας; See, also, στερεώματα, fr. 57 and notes.

## Fr. 194

**1. τὸν ἑπτάκτινα θεόν**: An allusion to the sun as the *Anagōgeus* of souls. Cf. Julian, *ibid.*, 172 a: τὰς ἀναγωγὰς ἀκτῖνας ἡλίου; Proclus, *In Tim.*, I, 34, 20-21: καὶ ὁ Ἀναγωγεὺς καὶ ὁ Ἑπτάκτις κατὰ τοὺς θεολόγους. See Lewy, pp. 186, n. 38; 199, n. 97; Theiler, 1942, p. 35 = 1966, pp. 294-295; Festugière, *Tim.*, I, p. 66, notes 3-4 (who suggests a further allusion to Mithra). Cf., also, ἀκτῖνας ἀγητάς, fr. 34 and notes.

**2-3. τῷ συρφετῷ**: Analogous to the "herd;" cf. frr. 153 and 154.

**3. θεουργοῖς τοῖς μακαρίοις**: Here, a reference to the Chaldean initiates. See Lewy, p. 463 and n. 15.

## Fr. 195

**1. τὸν χρόνον αὐτὸν ὑμνήκασιν (sc. οἱ θεουργοί) ὡς θεόν**: Cf., similarly, fr. 199: οἱ θεουργοὶ...ὑμνοῦσι <τοῦτον> τὸν θεὸν (sc. τὸν χρόνον). Cf., also, ἀκοιμήτου χρόνου, fr. 37 and notes; χρόνον ἀπέραντον, fr. 39; χρόνου χρόνος, fr. 185.

**2. ζωναῖον; ἄζωνον**: Equivalent to the ζῶναι and ἄζωνοι of fr. 188. In the context of Proclus, three additional Time gods are mentioned: an ἀρχαγγελικόν χρόνον; an ἀρχικὸν (χρόνον); a πηγαῖον (χρόνον). This sequence of five Time gods is related, respectively, to the planetary orbits, a third ethereal heaven, a second ethereal heaven, a first ethereal heaven, and finally, the empyrean heaven. Beyond the planets and heavens lies the πηγαία θεός, or Rhea-Hecate, as the source of this "chain." Cf. Psellus, *Hypotyp.*, 16-19, where the same sequence is repeated. See, also, Festugière, *Tim.*, IV, p. 64, n. 1.

## Fr. 196

**1. διὰ τοῦ θείου πυρός**: An allusion to the central rite of the Chaldean initiation; i.e., the purification of the ὄχημα-πνεῦμα via the mystical rays of the sun. Cf., esp., frr. 66, 110 and notes.

**2. κηλῖδας**: Cf. Synesius, *H.* 1(3), 550-551: δνοφερὰν ὕλας/κηλῖδα φέρω; *De insomn.*, 138 a: ἐναπομοργνυμένης κηλῖδα τῆς χείρονος (sc. ἕξεως). See Geudtner, pp. 14-15. However, as Lewy notes (p. 260, n. 7), κηλίς is a common metaphor found in a variety of Platonic sources. Cf., also, μὴ πνεῦμα μολύνῃς, fr. 104.

**3. τῆς ψυχῆς τὸ πνεῦμα**: For Proclus, the "pneumatic" vehicle of the lower soul is distinguished from the "luminous" vehicle of the higher soul. But this is not a Chaldean doctrine. See, esp., fr. 119 and notes.

## Fr. 197

**1. κλείς**: In the context of Damascius, the term "key" designates both the "intellectual division" (νοερὴ διαίρεσις), understood in its totality as "connective" (συνοχική), and the "intelligible division" (νοητὴ διαίρεσις), understood as "eternity" (αἰῶν). But the precise Chaldean use of κλείς remains problematic. Indeed, κλείς may well have an Orphic origin. Cf., e.g., *Orph. Fr.* 82 (Kern), where Phanes is designated κληῖδα νοῦ; *Orph. Hymn* 1. 7 (ed. Athanassakis), where Hecate is called κληιδοῦχον. Cf., also, Proclus, *H.* I.3, where it is the sun who ἔχων κληῖδα. See, also, Lewy, pp. 150, n. 309; 363, n. 200.

## Fr. 198

**1. ὁ κρύφιος διάκοσμος**: This is most likely an Orphic expression (and so Tardieu, Lewy$^2$, p. 680; Des Places, p. 113; Lewy, p. 78, n. 45; Hadot, *Porphyre*, I, p. 306, n. 4). In Orphic terms, this "hidden order" is symbolized by the Orphic "egg." Cf. Proclus, *loc. cit.*, l. 5: ὡς γὰρ τὸ ὠόν τὴν σπερματικὴν αἰτίαν τοῦ ζῴου προείληφεν. Festugière, however, (*Tim.*, II, p. 307, n. 2, following Diehl), does not discount a Chaldean origin. In this regard, cf. Damasicus, I, 284, 7: τὸν κρύφιον διάκοσμον...ὃν...οἱ θεοὶ ἀνυμνήκασι. As such, the "hidden order" would correspond to the Chaldean Paternal Abyss as the source of all things. See Lewy, Exc. VII, p. 483.

## Fr. 199

This fragment, although Chaldean in inspiration, most likely derives from a prose work of Julian the Theurgist and not from the *Oracles*. See introductory comments to fr. 188.

**1. πρεσβύτερον καὶ νεώτερον**: The *locus classicus* is Plato, *Tim.*, 38 a, where these comparatives are descriptive of "forms of time" (χρόνου εἴδη) which "imitate eternity" (αἰῶνα μιμουμένου). Cf. Synesius, *H.* 8(9), 67-69: ἀλλ' αὐτὸς ἀγήραος/Αἰὼν ὁ παλαιγενὴς/νεὸς ὢν ἅμα καὶ γέρων. Lewy (p. 103, n. 154) feels that these lines from Synesius give further evidence that Aion and Chronos were equated in the Chaldean system. Dodds maintains, however, that the two gods were distinct. (See notes to ἀκοιμητοῦ χρόνου, fr. 37.) In this regard, note that in v. 63 of the aforementioned hymn, Synesius specifically mentions ἀκαμαντοπόδας Χρόνος as *distinct* from Aion. Thus, *pace* Lewy, Aion and Chronos may well have been distinct in the Chaldean system as well, despite Synesius' free use of epithets, viz. "young and old;" "unageing".

**κυκλοέλικτον**: My translation is based on Festugière, *Tim.*, IV, 39: "se déroulant en circle." Des Places (p. 113) translates: "à la révolution circulaire." Cf. Lewy, p. 102 and n. 151: "moving in a circle." This expression is also found in *Orph. Hymn* 8. 11 (ed. Athanassakis): κυκλοέλικτε (but here, descriptive of the sun). Aion, of course, is equated with the transmundane sun in the Chaldean system.

**2. αἰώνιον**: Time is "eternal" in the sense that it "imitates" Eternity but, in Plato's words (*Tim.*, 37 e), κατ' ἀριθμόν.

## Fr. 200

See introductory comments to fr. 188.

1. **μεσεμβολήσας**: The central position of the sun is common to the *Oracles*. Cf. frr. 58, 65, 70; Lewy, p. 124, n. 221 d.

## Fr. 201

1. **ὀχήματα**: In the context of Proclus, this term refers specifically to the "pneumatic" vehicles of embodied souls. The original text of Plato, however (*Tim.*, 41 e), referred to the "vehicles" of the stars. See discussion in Introduction; Festugière, *Tim.*, I, p. 28, n. 2.

## Fr. 202

1. **ἡ πανδεκτικὴ αὐλή**: αὐλή goes back to Homer; e.g., *Od.* 4.74: Ζηνὸς αὐλή. In Chaldean usage, the "court open to all" designates the noetic home of the Father. Cf. Synesius, *H.* 1(3), 37, 710; 2(4), 292: ἐπὶ σὰς αὐλάς; Proclus, *H.* I.32: πατρὸς πολυφεγγέας αὐλάς; II.6: πυριφεγγέας αὐλάς; Arnobius, *Adv. nat.*, II.62: "aulam sibi eius patere." See, also, πρὸς πατρὸς αὐγάς, fr. 115 and notes; Lewy, p. 33 and n. 92.

## Fr. 203

1. **τῶν στερεωμάτων**: Cf. fr. 57 and notes.

**σειρά**: Kroll, *loc. cit.*, (and so Tardieu, Lewy$^2$, p. 689; cf. Lewy, p. 84, n. 66) identifies this term as Orphic. Cf., e.g., *Orph. Fr.* 166 (Kern): σειρὴν χρυσείην. (The *locus classicus* is *Il.* 8. 19.) Theiler, however (1942, p. 27, n. 4 = 1966, p. 285, n. 109; see, also, Des Places, p. 114, *ad not.*), argues for a Chaldean origin: "Die σειρά...durfte...in den Orakeln gestanden haben, ja von da im Sinne von 'Abhängigkeitsreihe' zu den Neuplatonikern gelangt sein." Cf. Psellus, *Hypotyp.*, 28: ἑκάστης δὲ σειρᾶς ἡ ἀκρότης πηγὴ ὀνομάζεται. Kroll, *loc. cit.*, argues that the Chaldeans substituted πηγή for σειρά, but such a conjecture is unwarranted. Cf., e.g., Synesius, *H.* 1(3), 289-290: ἀγγελικὰ...σειρά; Proclus, *In rem p.*, II, 255, 26: τῆς ἀγγελικῆς σειρᾶς. Cf., also, τάξις, frr. 24, 110 and notes, which is analogous to σειρά.

## Fr. 204

1. **ἐν τῷ σώματι τῷ σκιδναμένῳ**: An allusion to the body made up of "flowing" matter. Cf. ῥευστὸν σῶμα, fr. 128; ῥόθιον κύτος, fr. 186. Cf., also, ἀποσκεδάσας τόδε σῶμα, fr. 217 (in a post-mortem context). But Lewy (p. 277, n. 73, *contra* Kroll, *loc. cit.*) questions a Chaldean origin for this term, noting that the expression is also used by Numenius, fr. 4a (Des Places): σῶμα...σκιδνάμενον; cf. fr. 4b: τὰ σώματα...σκεδαστά. The *locus classicus* is Plato, *Tim.*, 37 a: οὐσίαν σκεδαστήν. The context of Proclus, however, is a commentary on Plato, *Rep.*, X, 620 a-d ("The Myth of Er"). But Proclus is not concerned here with the problem of whether the human soul can reincarnate in the body of a beast (which Proclus assumes, following Plato and Plotinus, but *contra* the *Oracles*; see fr. 160 and notes), but whether the soul of an animal is properly animated by its "human" component or by the soul ἐν κατάταξιν, which is its own soul. See Festugière, *Rép.* III, p. 294, n. 3.

## Fr. 205

As Tardieu notes (Lewy$^2$, p. 680), στερεώματα here is simply a repetition of the same in fr. 57 and, therefore, should be excised.

## Fr. 206

**1. στρόφαλον**: According to Psellus, Hecate's "magic wheel" was a golden disc embedded with a sapphire and inscribed with magical characters. (Psellus also equates this term with ἴυγξ.) Thus, by spinning this wheel, the transcendent Iynges (see frr. 76, 77) were "called on" to participate in the Chaldean rites. In Lewy's words (p. 250): "We may accordingly suppose that when the magical instrument was set in motion, it affected *per analogiam* the revolving spheres and attracted the celestial Iynges." The spinning of the στρόφαλος/ἴυγξ could also affect the weather. Marinus, *loc. cit.*, tells us that Proclus ended a drought in Attica by using ἴυγγά τινα. Cf., also, στροφάλιγγι, frr. 49 and 87; *C.M.A.G.* VI, p. 201,20 (Bidez): ἡ Ἑκατικὴ δὲ στροφάλιγξ μετὰ τοῦ ταυρείου ἱμάντος καὶ τῆς ἰυγγικῆς ἐπικλήσεως ὀνόματα μόνα κενά. See, also, Lewy, p. 249 and notes 78-80. My translation of the fragment is that of Lewy.

## Fr. 207

**1. συνοχεύς**: In the context of Proclus, this term is specifically descriptive of ὁ ἅπαξ ἐπέκεινα (see fr. 152, of which this fragment is a continuation). Cf., also, ὁ πρῶτος συνοχεύς, fr. 84 and notes.

**πασῶν τῶν πηγῶν**: i.e., the Ideas. Cf., esp., πηγαί, fr. 49 and notes.

## Fr. 208

Tardieu (Lewy$^2$, p. 680) would excise frr. 208-210 as "fragmenta extraria." Although these terms may not derive from the *Oracles* per se, I have included them here (following Des Places' edition) on the basis that they help broaden our understanding of the Chaldean system as a whole.

**1. συστάσεσι**: This term is particularly associated with the magical papyri, where it is descriptive of the "union" or "conjunction" of the magician with the god invoked. The point of the σύστασις was to make a "pact" with a ministering spirit so that he would aid the magician/theurgist during the soul's ascent. The σύστασις was achieved via various rites and the uttering of *nomina barbara*. See discussion in Introduction; Lewy, pp. 228-238; Eitrem, "Die σύστασις," pp. 49-53; "La Théurgie," pp. 49-79. A possible σύστασις may also be alluded to in *Marsanes*, NHC X, 2,14-16: ⲡⲧⲁϣ ⲛ̄ⲧⲉⲣⲛⲱⲥⲓⲥ. See Pearson, *Nag Hammadi Codices IX and X*, notes *ad loc.*

**ἐντυχίαις**: According to Lewy (p. 239 and n. 42), these were special "supplicatory prayers" offered to the various Chaldean "Time gods" (see, e.g., Proclus, *In Tim.*, III, 41,3-4) as a preliminary to their actual conjuration. This term is also found frequently in the magical papyri; e.g., *PGM* IV. 1930: ἐντυχία πρὸς ἥλιον. See Lewy, p. 239, n. 43.

**2. στροφάλοις**: See στρόφαλον, fr. 206.

## Fr. 209

The term ὑπερκόσμιος is part of the introductory material to fr. 59 and is discussed there.

## Fr. 210

**1 + 2. χαλκίς/κύμινδις**: In the *Iliad* (14. 291), χαλκίς is a name given by the gods to an unknown bird, which men refer to as κύμινδις. But the precise Chaldean use of these terms remains problematic. However, since Proclus associates χαλκίς with χαλκός ("brass"), Lewy (p. 291 and n. 124) surmises that brass instruments were used in the Chaldean rites to drive away evil spirits. The clanging of brass or copper instruments for apotropaic purposes was a widespread popular practice in Antiquity. In this regard, see Bailey, *The Religion of Ancient Rome*, p. 39 re the clanging of brass instruments to drive away ghosts at the time of the Lemuria in May.

## Fr. 210a

Fragments 210a-c are now cited by Des Places as containing additional Chaldean vocabulary, although he notes that these terms are not exclusive to the *Oracles*. See "Notes," p. 328.

**1. μαλάχης ἀπέχεσθαι**: "Mallow" is a plant known for its laxative effect. Evidently the *Oracles* prescribed various remedies for each month of the year. See fr. 210b and Des Places, *ibid.* On the relation of various Chaldean rites and the health of the body, see, e.g., Iambl., *De myst.*, II.6: ἡ μὲν τῶν θεῶν παρουσία δίδωσιν ἡμῖν ὑγείαν σώματος, ψυχῆς ἀρετήν, νοῦ καθαρότητα κτλ.

## Fr. 210b

**1. γαλακτοποτεῖν**: On the medicinal value of milk, see *PW*, 15,2, s.v. Milch, esp. cols. 1573-1576.

## Fr. 210c

**1. δημιουργικαῖς δυνάμεσιν**: These "demiurgic powers" were responsible for creating the world. Cf. Proclus, *Th. pl.*, 380, 51 ff.; Lewy, p. 92, n. 106.

**1-2. θεουργῶν παῖδες**: Most likely a reference to theurgists, in general, who followed the teachings of the *Juliani*.

**2. χεῖρας**: As "hands," these demiurgic powers were believed to contain certain properties peculiar to each hand. According to Proclus, *In Tim.*, II, 260, 24-28, the Chaldeans symbolized the life-giving power of the World Soul through terms associated with Hecate; e.g., "temples," "hands," "loins," etc. See Lewy, p. 92, n. 107; cf. frr. 51 and 52. See, also, fr. 68, where the expression αὐτουργῶν ("working with his own hands") describes the creative activity of the Second or Demiurgic Intellect.

## DOUBTFUL FRAGMENTS

The following fragments are categorized as "dubia" by Des Places ("fragmenta extraria" by Tardieu, Lewy², p. 680) because of metrical and other problems. Although Lewy contends (p. 37, n. 109) that the term ἔπη (sc. λόγια δ' ἐπῶν) was not necessarily limited to verses in hexameter, both Dodds ("New Light," p. 267, n. 17 = Lewy², p. 697, n. 17) and Festugière (*Rép.* I, p. 129, n. 3) argue (rightly) that any meter *other* than hexameter would *a priori* exclude that a given verse(s) derives from the *Oracles*. Dodds, in particular, would separate the oracles collected by Lewy into Theosophical, Porphyrian, and Chaldean, and not attempt (as Lewy did) to "fuse" parts of one group with another. Further arguments pro and con a Chaldean origin are discussed *infra* in each case.

### Fr. 211

**1. τοῦ δοχῆος**: Lewy (p. 41 and n. 126; cf. Exc. III, p. 458) argues that this *nomen agentis* is a Chaldean neologism; thus, despite the meter (trochaic tetrameter), Lewy feels this verse has a probable Chaldean origin. Dodds, however ("New Light," see *supra*), *because* of the meter, argues for a Porphyrian origin, noting that although the later Neoplatonists connected this term with the practice of theurgy, they probably learned it from Porphyry and not from the *Oracles*, despite Proclus' use of the formulaic φησίν τις θεῶν. See, also, Wolff, p. 160.) The more common expression is χάτοχος. In a theurgic context, the "recipient" is the medium who "receives" the conjured god. (Proclus cites this verse in conjunction with fr. 146 re the conjuration of Hecate.)

### Fr. 212

**1. ἃ δὴ λέγει νοῦς**: cj. Des Places (for metrical purposes). Again, the problem with this verse (as a whole) is one of meter (which Des Places has constructed as an iambic trimeter). But Lewy (p. 112, n. 181) accepts a Chaldean origin, and understands this verse in conjunction with fr. 175. Kroll, *loc. cit.*, also suggests a Chaldean origin, but admits that the verse may have been part of Psellus' interpretation. In light of the metrical difficulties, this is a likely supposition. In the context of Psellus, the line refers, in general, to the communication between man and God ἕκαστος καθὼς ἔχει φύσεως ἐνεργῶν.

### Fr. 213

On the basis of "terminology, form and contents," Lewy (p. 172, n. 403) considers this oracle authentically Chaldean. Des Places, however (p. 151), points out that the facility in phrasing contrasts with the "laborious composition" of the undoubted fragments. In addition, Didymus' expression οἱ ἔξω—as the source of the quote—is a general expression and not used elsewhere as a specific introductory formula for Chaldean material. The vocabulary, however, as Lewy notes, has points of similarity with the undoubted fragments.

**2. φεῦγε τάχος**: The theme of "swift flight" is common to the *Oracles*. Cf. frr. 107, 115, 116, 130, 134.

**3. ψυχῆς ὄμμα**: Cf. *ibid.*, fr. 1; ὄμματα πάντα, fr. 112.

**αὐγάς**: Cf., *ibid.*, fr. 115; αὐγῆς, fr. 35.

**4. χαλινά**: Cf. χαλινῶσαι, fr. 113.

**5. αἰθερίης πατρὸς αἴγλης**: In the undoubted fragments, however, the Father's (fiery) essence is associated with the Empyrean, not Ethereal realm. Lewy's explanation (p. 173, n. 405) is weak: "The designation of the noetic essence as αἰθερίη (instead of ἐμπυρίη) πατρὸς αἴγλη is due to their (sc. "the vision of the Ideas") being mediated by the solar rays."

## Fr. 214

Again, Didymus attributes these lines, in general, to οἱ ἔξω. Des Places (p. 151), considers the oracle more Stoic than Chaldean in inspiration. Lewy, however (p. 86, n. 74), feels the last two lines may have a Chaldean origin because of the use of κάρτος and ἀλκή. Although forms of ἀλκή are found *passim* in the undoubted fragments, κάρτος is not similarly attested (but cf. κραταιόν, fr. 35). κάρτος is found in conjunction with ἀλκή in *Theos.* 35, but Dodds has shown, *contra* Lewy, that a Chaldean origin for this material is problematic. See "New Light," pp. 265-266 = Lewy$^2$, pp. 695-696; cf. Des Places, pp. 55-56. (Des Places would now consider placing *Theos.* 35 among the "Doubtful Fragments" of the *Oracles*, but with the same reservations expressed re fr 213 *supra*. See *ANRW*, II.17.4, p. 2303.)

## Fr. 215

Although Lydus uses the formulaic ὁ χρησμός (see Lewy, Exc. I, p. 446 p), these lines are most likely not Chaldean in origin. Des Places (p. 151) notes that the notion of God (Zeus) dispensing evil is congenial neither to the *Oracles* nor to Neoplatonism. The literary model is *Il.* 24. 528-533. In addition, as with fr. 213, Des Places again contrasts the facility of composition with the "vigueur Chaldaïque." Finally, the vocabulary lacks any distinctive Chaldean "stamp." The oracle is ignored by Lewy and Kroll.

## Fr. 216

Lewy (p. 267, n. 25) argues that these verses are Chaldean, but an Orphic origin is also possible. See comments, *infra*.

**3. ἐνύδρια πνεύματα**: Perhaps analogous to the κυνῶν ὑγρῶν, fr. 91; ὑδροβατῆρας, fr. 92.

**4. κόλποι <τε> καὶ ἠέριοι**: Cf. κόλπων τ' ἠερίων, fr. 61.

**5. μηναῖοι πάσης ἐπιβήτορες κτλ.**: Cf. Psellus, *P.G.*, 122, 1137 a 5-7: μορφαὶ δαιμονιώδες...ἀπὸ πάντων δὲ τῶν μερῶν τοῦ σεληναίου κόσμου. Lewy (see *supra*) thinks Psellus' interpretation (which pertains specifically to fr. 88) alludes to the "lunar riders" ( = demons) mentioned here. Cf., also, ἐπιβήτορα, fr. 44, with regard to Eros.

**6. ὕλης οὐρανίας κτλ.**: Cf. fr. 173 and notes, where Olympiodorus attributes this line to Orpheus ( = *Orph. Fr.* 353, Kern; see Kroll, *loc. cit.*). Lewy (see *supra*) argues that Olympiodorus mistakenly attributed this line to Orpheus because his source (Proclus) probably ascribed it to οἱ θεόλογοι, a term applied equally by the later Neoplatonists to the Orphic and Chaldean traditions(cf. Lewy, Exc. I, p. 444 d). But the true source of this oracle remains in doubt.

## Fr. 217

Kroll (*app. crit.* to Proclus citation) felt that these verses were "alienum" to the *Oracles*. Lewy, however (pp. 31-33 and notes 87-94), argues for authenticity, noting that the "form and style" of these verses are similar to the oracles cited by Porphyry (as reported by Eusebius). But as Dodds has rightly argued (see *supra*, introductory comments, p. 217), these so-called "Porphyrian" oracles should be distinguished from the Chaldean λόγια. The vocabulary of this fragment, however, has certain parallels with the undoubted fragments. See *infra*.

**4. μελάθρων**: Analogous to αὐλή, fr. 202.

**8. σπλάγχνοισιν**: Cf. σπλάγχνων, fr. 107. Fr. 107, as a whole, similarly warns against the efficacy of traditional methods of soothsaying.

**9. ἀποσκεδάσας**: Here, in a post-mortem context. But, cf. σκίδνασθαι, fr. 204 and notes.

## Fr. 218

Although Kroll, *loc. cit.*, cites these verses, he doubts a Chaldean origin. (Lewy does not comment on them at all.) Des Places (p. 35) thinks the fragment is more "Orphic" than Chaldean in inspiration. In the context of Synesius, these lines are an oblique commentary on Plato, *Tim.*, 42 a-b (which Synesius embellishes with the doctrine of the descent of the ὄχημα-πνεῦμα).

**4. ἄναξ**: Apollo? See Kroll, *loc. cit.*, n. 2; cf. *ibid.*, fr. 225.

## Fr. 219

Frr. 219-225 are properly "Porphyrian" and not Chaldean in origin. Although Terzaghi, *loc. cit.*, assigned them a Chaldean origin (based on their inclusion in Nicephorus Gregoras' commentary on Synesius' *De insomn.*; cf. Kroll, p. 5), Terzaghi was apparently unaware that these same fragments also make up part of Porphyry's *De philos. ex or. haur.*; Wolff, pp. 130-131; 155-158; 162. Des Places has included these fragments in his edition, but with the appropriate caveats (see his comments, p. 119). Lewy also rejects most of these fragments as "non-Chaldean" (see pp. 51-52 and n. 162), although noting certain similarities in style and form to the undoubted fragments. See additional comments *infra* in each case.

**6. τεῇς ὑποθημοσύνῃσι**: Cf., in contrast, θεῶν ὑποθημοσύνῃσι, fr. 222 and notes.

**7. πειθοῖ τ' ἀρρήτων ἐπέων**: Cf. πειθανάγκην, l. 2. Both these expressions underscore the non-compulsive aspect of theurgy (in contrast to traditional magic), where the gods appear of their own volition and not at the command of the adept (see discussion in Introduction). But Lewy (p. 58, n. 184) notes that the use of this expression here (in a "non-Chaldean" oracle) indicates that theurgy (as a "passive" enterprise between man and the gods) was apparently not strictly limited to the Chaldean tradition. Cf., e.g., *PGM* I.51: λόγοις θεολογουμένοις πείσαντες.

## Fr. 220

**2. κλῦθί μευ**: This expression is Homeric; e.g., *Il.* 1. 37. The god invoked here is probably Apollo (and so Theodoretus, *loc. cit.*).

**ἐπέδησας**: i.e., the "binding" of the god during the conjuration rite. Cf. fr. 41 re the "loosing" of the god. See, also, Lewy, pp. 41-42; 57-58 and n. 184.

**ἀνάγκῃ**: Cf. ἀναγκαζόμενος, l. 1; ἀνάγκαις, fr. 221. Here, a compulsive element is obvious. The god is invoked and bound "against his will" (οὐκ ἐθέλοντος; cf. ἀέκοντας, fr. 223) and not via the "persuasive words" of the caller (as is the case with fr. 219). For Lewy (p. 51, n. 162), such language belies a Chaldean origin.

## Fr. 221

**2. ἀπ' αἰθέρος**: Cf. ἀπ' αἴθρης, fr. 223.

**3. θειοδάμοις/ἀνάγκαις**: Again, this compulsive element argues against a Chaldean origin.

## Fr. 222

**2. ἦλυθον**: Cf. ἦκα, fr. 72 (with reference to Hecate).

**τεῆς πολυφράδμονος εὐχῆς**: Perhaps a "supplicatory" prayer. Cf. ἐντυχίαι, fr. 208 and notes.

**3. θεῶν ὑποθημοσύνῃσι**: Here, *contra* fr. 219, it is the gods who convey their "binding" spells to man and not vice versa.

## Fr. 223

**2. ἀπορρήτοις ἴυγξιν**: Here, the term ἴυγξ seems closest in sense to the συνθήματα/σύμβολα as *voces mysticae*. But cf. fr. 206, where the στρόφαλος/ἴυγξ of Hecate is also described as ἀπόρρητος by Psellus.

**ἀπ' αἴθρης**: Cf. ἀπ' αἰθέρος, fr. 221.

**3. ἀέκοντας**: Cf. οὐκ ἐθέλοντος, fr. 220 and notes.

**4. μεσάτοισιν ἐπεμβεβαῶτας (sc. δαίμονας) ἀήταις**: i.e., demons of the air. Cf., e.g., ἠερίων κυνῶν, fr. 91.

**5. πανομφέας ὀνείρους**: Dreams were traditionally believed to be conveyed to men via demons of the air or moon. See Lewy, p. 93.

## Fr. 224

Lewy (p. 51, n. 162) specifically argues that this oracle is "non-Chaldean" because the instructions here concerning the making and consecrating of Hecate's statue contradict the descriptions of Hecate's statue as gleaned from the undoubted fragments. Cf., e.g., frr. 51, 52, 55, 72, 89 and notes. However, in a general sense, the use of herbs, animals, scents, etc. figured prominently in theurgic practice. See, esp., Dodds, "Theurgy," 1947, pp. 62-63 = 1957, pp. 292-293.

**5. σκαλαβώταις**: Lizards traditionally figured in magical practice. See Nock, "The Lizard in Magic and Religion," *Essays*, I, pp. 271-276.

**7. αἰθριάσας**: Cf. the invocation of Hecate in fr. 146, which also takes place in the open.

**7-8. ὑπὸ μήνην αὔξουσαν**: Cf. the ritual described in the *Mithras Liturgy* (ed. Meyer), p. 23, which similarly takes place in conjunction with various phases of the moon.

**8. ἐπευχόμενος τήνδ' εὐχήν**: Cf. εὐχῆς, fr. 222. The "prayer" alluded to here probably consisted of both ordinary praises as well as *voces mysticae*. Cf., e.g., *Mithras Liturgy*, *ibid.*

## Fr. 225

Lewy (p. 40 and n. 118) parallels this oracle with fr. 211 and thus argues for a probable Chaldean origin. However, as noted *supra*, the authenticity of fr. 221 (*contra* Lewy) is doubtful.

**2. λύετε**: i.e., the "loosing" of the god after he has been "bound." Cf. ἔκλυσις θεοῦ, fr. 141 and notes.

**ἄνακτα**: Again, probably Apollo. Cf. ἄναξ, fr. 218 and notes.

**θεὸν οὐκέτι χωρεῖ**: According to Lewy (p. 41 and n. 123), analogous to οὐ φέρει με, fr. 211. Cf., also, Iambl., *De myst.*, III.11: χωρεῖν τὸν θεόν (in a divination context).

## Fr. 226

Although Kroll, *loc. cit.*, thought this fragment was Chaldean in origin, Lewy (p. 444 d) argues for an Orphic origin. (See *Orph. Fr.* 188, Kern.) As Des Places notes (p. 121), Dionysus does not play a role in any of the undoubted fragments. But cf. Psellus, *P.G.* 122, 1152 b 6-8, who identifies the ἀζωνικοὶ θεοί as Sarapis, Dionysos, Osiris, and Apollo. Similarly, Proclus, *loc. cit.*, mentions Osiris (as well as Dionysos) as one of the gods mentioned in the "books of the theologians and theurgists." Although οἱ θεολόγοι can apply equally to the Chaldean and Orphic traditions, οἱ θεουργοί is a specific Chaldean designation. Thus, a Chaldean origin for this fragment is not out of the question. See, also, Festugière, *Tim.*, IV, p. 169, n. 1.

**3. πόλον**: Cf. πόλων, fr. 35. Cf., also, *Mithras Liturgy* (ed. Meyer), p. 14, where "King Helios" is said to come εἰς τὸν πόλον after a lengthy invocation.

# BIBLIOGRAPHY

## I. Primary Sources


*Anonymus Taurinensis*. See W. Kroll, "Ein neuplatonischer Parmenides commentar in einem Turiner Palimpsest." *Rheinishes Museum für Philologie*, XLVII, 1892, pp. 599-627. Cf., *infra*, Porphyry, *In Parmenidem*.

Arnobius. *Adversus Nationes*. Ed. C. Marchesi. 2nd ed. Corpus Paravianum. Turin, 1953.

Boethius. *Philosophiae Consolatio*. Ed. L. Bieler. Corpus Christianorum Series Latina XCIV. Turnholt: Typographi Brepols, 1957.

*The Books of Jeu and the Untitled Text in the Bruce Codex*. Nag Hammdai Studies XIII. Trans. V. MacDermot. Ed. C. Schmidt. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1978.

*Corpus Hermeticum*. 4 vols. Trans. A.-J. Festugière. Ed. A. D. Nock. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1954-1960; rpt. 1972-1983.

Damascius. *Commentary on Plato's Phaedo*. In *The Greek Commentaries on Plato's Phaedo*. Vol. II. Trans. and ed. L. G. Westerink. Amsterdam: North-Holland Publishing Co., 1977. Cf. *infra*, Olympiodorus, *In Phaedonem*, Norvin, pp. 84-244.

——. *Dubitationes et Salutiones de Primis Principiis in Platonis Parmenidem*. 2 vols. Ed. C. A. Ruelle. Paris, 1889; rpt. Bruxelles: Culture et Civilization, 1964. French translation in 3 vols. by A.-Ed. Chaignet. Paris, 1898; rpt. Bruxelles: Culture et Civilization, 1964.

——. *Vitae Isidori Reliquiae*. Ed. C. Lintzen. Hildesheim: Georg Olms, 1967.

Didymus. *De Trinitate*. In J. P. Migne, *P.G.* Vol. 122, cols. 269A-992C.

Eusebius of Caesarea. *Preparatio Evangelica*. 2 vols. Ed. C. Mras. *G.C.S.*, 43. Berlin, 1954-1956.

*Gnosis: A Selection of Gnostic Texts*. 2 vols. Ed. W. Foerster. English translation by R. McL. Wilson. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1972-1974.

*Hermès en Haute-Égypte*. 2 vols. Trans. and ed. J.-P. Mahé. Québec: Les Presses de l'Université Laval, 1978-1982.

*Hermetica*. 4 vols. Trans. and ed. W. Scott. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1924-1936.

Hermias. *In Platonis Phaedrum Scholia*. Ed. P. Couvreur. 2nd ed. Paris, 1901; rpt. Hildesheim: Georg Olms, 1971.

Hierocles. *Commentarius in Aurem Carmen*. In *Fragmenta Philosophorum Graecorum*. Vol. I. Ed. E. Mullach. 2nd ed. Paris, 1860; rpt. Darmstadt: Scientia Verlag Aalen, 1968. New edition by F. G. Koehler. Stuttgart: B. G. Teubner, 1974.

Iamblichus. *Les Mystères d'Égypte*. Trans. and ed. É. Des Places. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1966.

——. *Iamblichi Chalcidensis: In Platonis Dialogos Commentariorum Fragmenta*. Trans. and ed. J. Dillon. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1973.

Italicus, Michel. *Letter XVII*. In *Anecdota graeca e codd. mss. bibliothecarum oxoniensum*. III. Ed. J. A. Cramer. Oxford, 1836, pp. 180-183. Cf. É. Des Places, *Oracles Chaldaïques*, pp. 214-217.

Jean Lydus. *De Mensibus*. Ed. R. Wuensch. Leipzig, 1898; rpt. Stuttgart: B.G. Teubner, 1967.

Julian. *Oration* V. In *The Works of the Emperor Julian*. Vol. I. Trans. and ed. W. C. Wright. Loeb Classical Library. New York: Macmillan; London: William Heinemann, 1913.

Marinus. *Vita Procli*. Ed. J. F. Boissonade. Leipzig, 1814; rpt. Amsterdam: Adolf M. Hakkert, 1966.

Marius Victorinus. *Traités Théologiques sur la Trinité*. 2 vols. Trans. P. Henry. Ed. P. Hadot. Sources Chrétiennes, nos. 68-69. Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1960.

*The "Mithras Liturgy"*. Trans. and ed. M. Meyer. *SBL* Texts and Translations 10. Graeco-Roman Religious Series 2. Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1976.

*Nag Hammadi Codices III, 2 and IV, 2. The Gospel of the Egyptians*. (The Holy Book of the Great Invisible Spirit.) Nag Hammadi Studies IV. Trans. and eds. A. Böhlig and F. Wisse. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1975.

*Nag Hammadi Codices V, 2-5 and VI with Papyrus Berolinensis 8502, 1 and 4*. Nag Hammadi Studies XI. Vol. ed. D. Parrott. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1979.

*Nag Hammadi Codices IX and X*. Nag Hammadi Studies XV. Vol. ed. B. Pearson. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1979.

*The Nag Hammadi Library in English*. Ed. J. M. Robinson. San Francisco: Harper and Row, 3rd ed. rev. 1988.

Nicephorus Gregoras. *In Synesii de Insomniis*. In J. P. Migne, *P.G.* Vol. 149, cols. 521A-642C.

Numenius. *Fragments*. Trans. and ed. É. Des Places. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1973.

Olympiodorus. *Commentary on the First Alcibiades of Plato*. Ed. L. G. Westerink. Amsterdam: North-Holland Publishing Co., 1956.

——. *Commentary on Plato's Phaedo*. In *The Greek Commentaries on Plato's Phaedo*. Vol. I. Trans. and ed. L. G. Westerink. Amsterdam: North-Holland Publishing Co., 1976.

——. *In Platonis Phaedonem Commentaria*. Ed. W. Norvin. Leipzig, 1913; rpt. Hildesheim: Georg Olms, 1958. Cf. Damascius, *In Phaedonem*, *supra*.

*Oracles Chaldaïques*. Trans. and ed. È. Des Places. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1971.

*De Oraculis Chaldaicis*. Ed. W. Kroll. Breslauer Philologische Abhandlungen. Breslau: Wilhelm Koebner, 1895; rpt. Hildesheim: Georg Olms, 1962.

*The Orphic Hymns*. Trans. and ed. A. Athanassakis. *SBL* Texts and Translations 12. Graeco-Roman Religious Series 4. Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1977.

*Orphicorum Fragmenta*. Ed. O. Kern. 2nd ed. Berlin: Weidmannos, 1963.

*Papyri Graecae Magicae. Die Griechischen Zauberpapyri*. 2 vols. Trans. and ed. K. Priesendanz. 2nd. ed. rev. Stuttgart: B. G. Teubner, 1963-1964. English translation edited by Hans Dieter Betz. Chicago & London: The University of Chicago Press, 1986.

*Pistis Sophia*. Nag Hammadi Studies IX. Trans. V. MacDermot. Ed. C. Schmidt. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1978.

Plotinus. *Enneads*. Text and French translation in 7 vols. Ed. E. Bréhier. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1924-1938. Text and English translation in 7 vols. Ed. A. H. Armstrong. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1966-1988. English translation by S. MacKenna. 3rd ed. rev. by B. S. Page. London: Faber & Faber, 1962.

Porphyry. *Opuscula Selecta*. Ed. A. Nauck. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1886; rpt. Hildesheim: Georg Olms, 1963.

——. *In Parmenidem*. See P. Hadot, *Porphyre et Victorinus*, II, pp. 59-113. Cf. *Anon. Taur.*, *supra*.

——. *De Philosophia ex Oraculis Haurienda*. Ed. G. Wolff. Hildesheim: Georg Olms, 1962.

——. *De Regressu Animae*. In J. Bidez, *Vie de Porphyre*. Hildesheim: Georg Olms, 1964, pp. 27*-44*.

——. *Sententiae ad Intelligibilia Ducentes*. Ed. E. Lamberz. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1975.

Proclus. *Commentarium in Platonis Parmenidem*. Vol. 3 of *Procli Philosophi Platonici*. Ed. V. Cousin. 2nd ed. Paris, 1864; rpt. Hildesheim: Georg Olms, 1961. French translation in 3 vols. by A.-Ed. Chaignet. Paris, 1900-1903; rpt. Frankfurt: Minerva, 1962. English translation by G. R. Morrow and J. M. Dillon. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1987.

——. *Commentarium in Parmenidem Platonis I-IV*. Translation of Guillaume de Moerbeke. Vol. 1. Ancient and Medieval Philosophy III. Ed. by C. Steel. Leuven: University Press, 1982.

——. *Commentarium in Parmenidem Platonis V-VII*. Vol. 2. Ancient and Medieval Philosophy IV. Ed. by C. Steel. Leuven: University Press, 1985. Cf. Klibansky-Labowsky, *infra*.

——. *Commentarium in Parmenidem: pars ultima adhuc inedita.* Plato Latinus, Vol. III. Ed. and trans. by R. Klibansky and C. Labowsky. London: Warburg Institute, 1953 (= Steel, vol. 2, pp. 495-521).

——. *Commentary on the First Alcibiades of Plato.* Ed. L. G. Westerink. Amsterdam: North-Holland Publishing Co., 1954. English translation by W. O'Neill. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1965; rpt. 1971.

——. *The Elements of Theology.* Trans. and ed. E. R. Dodds. 2nd ed. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1963.

——. *Excerpta Chaldaica Vaticana.* In J. B. Pitra, *Analecta Sacra et Classica.* Vol. V. Rome and Paris, 1888; rpt. Farnborough, England: Gregg Press, Ltd., 1967, pp. 192-195. Cf. É. Des Places, *Oracles Chaldaïques*, pp. 206-212.

——. *Hymni.* Ed. E. Vogt. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1957.

——. *De Magia (On the Hieratic Art).* Ed. J. Bidez. In *Catalogue des Manuscrits Alchimiques Grecs* VI. Bruxelles: Maurice Lamertin, 1928; pp. 139-151.

——. *In Platonis Cratylum Commentaria.* Ed. G. Pasquali. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1908.

——. *In Platonis Rem Publican Commentarii.* 2 vols. Ed. W. Kroll. Leipzig, 1899-1901; rpt. Amsterdam: Adolf M. Hakkert, 1965. French translation in 3 vols. by A.-J. Festugière. Paris: J. Vrin, 1970.

——. *In Platonis Timaeum Commentarii.* 3 vols. Ed. E. Diehl. Leipzig, 1903-1906; rpt. Amsterdam: Adolf M. Hakkert, 1965. French translation in 5 vols. by A.-J. Festugière. Paris: J. Vrin, 1966-1968.

——. *In Primum Euclidis Elementorum Librum Commentarii.* Ed. G. Friedlin. Leipzig, 1873; rpt. Hildesheim: Georg Olms, 1967. English translation by G. Morrow. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1970.

——. *Theologica Platonica.* Ed. A. Portus. Hamburg, 1618; rpt. Frankfurt: Minerva, 1960.

——. *Théologie platonicienne.* 4 vols. Trans. and eds. H.-D. Saffrey and L. G. Westerink. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1968-1981.

——. *Tria Opuscula. (De Providentia, Libertate, Malo).* Ed. H. Boese. Berlin: W. de Gruyter, 1960. French translation (with text) in 3 vols. by D. Isaac. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1977-1982.

Psellus. *De Aurea Catena.* In *Annuaire pour l'encouragement des études grecques en France* IX. Ed. C. Sathas. 1875, pp. 215-219.

——. *De Operatione Daemonum.* In J. P. Migne, *P.G.* Vol 122, cols. 821A-876A.

——. *Expositio Oraculorum Chaldaicorum.* In J. P. Migne, *P.G.* Vol. 122, cols. 1123A-1149B. Cf. É. Des Places, *Oracles Chaldaïques*, pp. 162-186.

——. *Hypotyposis.* In W. Kroll, *De Oraculis Chaldaicis*, pp. 73-76. Cf. É. Des Places, *Oracles Chaldaïques*, pp. 198-201.

——. *Summaria et Brevis Dogmatum Chaldaicorum Expositio.* In J. P. Migne, *P.G.* Vol. 122, cols. 1149C-1153B. Cf. É. Des Places, *Oracles Chaldaïques*, pp. 189-191.

Simplicius. *In Aristotelis de Caelo Commentaria.* Ed. I. L. Heiberg. *C.A.G.* Vol. VII. Berlin: G. Reimerus, 1894.

——. *In Aristotelis Physicorum Libros Quattuor Priores Commentaria.* Ed. H. Diels. *C.A.G.* Vol. IX. Berlin: G. Reimerus, 1882.

*Suidae Lexicon.* Vol. II. Ed. A. Adler. Leipzig, 1931; rpt. Stuttgart: B. G. Teubner, 1967.

Synesius. *The Essays and Hymns of Synesius of Cyrene.* 2 vols. Trans. A. Fitzgerald. London: Humphrey Milford, 1930.

——. *Hymnes.* Trans. and ed. C. Lacombrade. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1978.

——. *Hymni.* Ed. N. Terzaghi. Rome, 1939. Cf. J. P. Migne, *P.G.* Vol. 66, cols. 1587-1616.

——. *Opuscula.* Ed. N. Terzaghi. Rome, 1944. Cf. J. P. Migne, *P.G.* Vol. 66, cols. 1053A-1320C.

Theodoret. *Thérapeutique des Maladies Helléniques.* 2 vols. Trans. and ed. P. Canivet. Sources Chrétiennes, no. 57. Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1958.

## II. Secondary Sources


Abramowski, Luise. "Phil. 2,6 οὐχ ἁρπαγμὸν ἡγήσατο τὸ εἶναι ἴσαι θεῷ und Oracula chaldaica 3 (Des Places) ὁ πατὴρ ἥρπασσεν ἑαυτόν." In *Drei Christologische Untersuchungen*. Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1981, pp. 1-17.

Armstrong, Arthur Hilary. *The Architecture of the Intelligible Universe in the Philosophy of Plotinus*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1940.

——. ed. *The Cambridge History of Later Greek and Early Medieval Philosophy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1967.

——. "Platonic *Eros* and Christian *Agape*." *Downside Review*, 79, 1961, pp. 105-121; rpt. in A. H. Armstrong, *Plotinian and Christian Studies*. London: Variorum Reprints, 1979, section IX.

——. "Was Plotinus a Magician?" *Phronesis*, I, 1955, pp. 73-79.

Barb, A. A. "The Survival of Magic Arts." In *The Conflict Between Paganism and Christianity in the Fourth Century*. Ed. A. Momigliano. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1963, pp. 100-125.

Beierwaltes, Werner. "Der Begriff des 'unum in nobis' bei Proklos." In *Die Metaphysik im Mittelalter*. Vorträge des II. Internationalen Kongresses für Mittelalterliche Philosophie. Köln, 31 August-6 September, 1961. Ed. Paul Wilpert. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1963, pp. 255-266.

——. "The Love of Beauty and the Love of God." In *Classical Mediterranean Spirituality*. Ed. A. H. Armstrong. New York: Crossroad, 1986, pp. 293-313.

Bidez, Joseph. "Un Faux Dieu des Oracles Chaldaïques." *Revue de Philologie*, 1903, pp. 79-81.

——and Franz Cumont. *Les Mages Hellénisés*. 2 vols. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1938; rpt. 1973.

——. "Note sur les Mystères Néoplatoniciens." *Revue Belge de Philologie et d'Histoire*, 7, 1928, pp. 1477-1481.

——. "Proclus: περὶ τῆς ἱερατικῆς τέχνης." In *Mélanges Cumont*. Bruxelles: Université Libre de Bruxelles, 1936, pp. 85-100.

——. *La Vie de l'Empereur Julien*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1930.

——. *Vie de Porphyre*. Hildesheim: Georg Olms, 1964.

Bousset, D. W. "Der Gott Aion." (unpub.) In *D. Wilhelm Bousset: Religionsgeschichtliche Studien*. Ed. Anthonie F. Verheule. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1979, pp. 192-230.

——. "Die Himmelsreise der Seele." *Archiv für Religionswissenschaft*, 4, 1901, pp. 136-139.

Boyancé, Pierre. "Théurgie et Télestique Néoplatoniciennes." *Revue de l'Histoire des Religions*, 147, 1955, pp. 189-209.

Bremond, André. "Un Texte de Proclus sur la Prière et l'Union Divine." *Recherches de Science Religieuse*, 19, 1929, pp. 448-462.

Breton, Stanislas. "Téléologie et Ontogénie: Variations sur les 'Oracles Chaldaïques.'" *Recherches de Science Religieuse*, 66, 1978, pp. 5-25.

Cremer, Friedrich W. *Die Chaldäischen Orakel und Jamblich de mysteriis*. Meisenheim am Glan: Anton Hain, 1969.

Cumont, Franz. *Lux Perpetua*. Paris: Librairie Orientaliste Paul Geuthner, 1949.

——. *Oriental Religions in Roman Paganism*. London: G. Routledge and Sons, Ltd., 1911; rpt. New York: Dover Publications, 1956.

——. *La Théologie Solaire du Paganisme Romain*. Paris: Imprimerie Nationale, 1909.

Des Places, Édouard. "Jamblique et les *Oracles Chaldaïques*." *L'Académie des Inscriptions et Belle Lettres Comptes Rendus*, Jan.-Juin, 1964, pp. 178-185.

——. "Les *Mystères d'Égypte* et les *Oracles Chaldaïques*." *Oikoumene. Studi paleocristiani...* Catania, 1964, pp. 455-460; rpt. in Des Places, *Études Platoniciennes, 1929-1979*. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1981, pp. 355-360.

——. "Notes sur quelques *Oracles Chaldaïques*." In *Melanges Édouard Delebecque*. Aix-en-Provence: Publications Universite de Provence, 1983, pp. 321-329.

——. "Les *Oracles Chaldaïques*." In *Aufsteig und Niedergang der Römischen Welt*, II.17.4, 1984, pp. 2300-2335.

——. "Les *Oracles Chaldaïques* et Denys l'Aréopagite." In *Melanges Jean Trouillard*. Les Cahiers de Fontenay, Mars, 1981, pp. 291-295.

——. "La Religion de Jamblique." In *Entretiens sur l'Antiquité classique*. XXI: *De Jamblique à Proclus*. Vandoeuvres-Genève, 1975, pp. 69-94; rpt. in Des Places, *Études Platoniciennes, 1929-1979*. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1981, pp. 229-354.

——. "Le Renouveau Platonicien du XI[e] Siècle: Michel Psellus et les *Oracles Chaldaïques*." *L'Académie des Inscriptions et Belle Lettres Comptes Rendus*, Avril-Juin, 1966, pp. 313-324.

Dillon, John. "The Concept of Two Intellects: A Footnote to the History of Platonism." *Phronesis*, 18, 1973, pp. 176-185.

——. *The Middle Platonists*. London: Duckworth, 1977.

Dodds, E. R. "New Light on the 'Chaldean Oracles.'" *Harvard Theological Review*, 54, 1961, pp. 263-273; rpt. in H. Lewy, *Chaldean Oracles and Theurgy*. New edition. Ed. M. Tardieu. Paris, 1978, pp. 693-701.

——. "Numenius and Ammonius." *Entretiens sur l'Antiquité Classique*. XII: *Porphyre*. Vandoeuvres-Genève, 21-29 Août 1957. Genève: Fondation Hardt, 1960, pp. 3-61.

——. *Pagan and Christian in an Age of Anxiety*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1968.

——. "The Parmenides of Plato and the Origin of the Neoplatonic One." *Classical Quarterly*, 22, 1928, pp. 129-142.

——. "Supernormal Phenomena in Classical Antiquity." In *The Ancient Concept of Progress*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1973, pp. 156-210 (= Chapt. X).

——. "Theurgy and its Relationship to Neoplatonism." *Journal of Roman Studies*, 37, 1947, pp. 55-69; rpt. in E. R. Dodds, *The Greeks and the Irrational*. Boston: Beacon Press, 1957, pp. 283-311. (Appendix II.)

Dornsieff, F. *Das Alphabet in Mystik und Magie*. 2 Auflage. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1925; rpt. Leipzig: Zentralantiquariat der Deutschen Demokratischen Republik, 1975.

Eitrem, S. "Die σύστασις und der Lichtzauber in der Magie." *Symbolae Osloenses*, 8, 1929, pp. 49-53.

——. "La Théurgie chez les Néo-Platoniciens et dans les Papyrus Magiques." *Symbolae Osloenses*, 22, 1942, pp. 49-79.

Ellwood, Robert S., Jr. *Mysticism and Religion*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1980.

Festugière, A.-J. "Contemplation Philosophique et Art Théurgique chez Proclus." *Studi di Storia Religiosa della Tarda Antichita*. Messina, 1968, pp. 7-18; rpt. in A.-J. Festugière, *Études de Philosophie Grecque*. Paris: J. Vrin, 1971, pp. 585-596.

——. "La Religion Grecque à l'Époque Romaine." *Revue des Études Grecques*, 64, 1951, pp. 372-393.

——. *La Révélation d'Hermès Trismégiste*. 4 vols. Paris: Librairie Lecoffre, 1950-1954.

——. "Le sens philosophique du mot ΑΙΩΝ." *La Parola del Passato*, XI, pp. 172-189; rpt. in A.-J. Festugière, *Études de Philosophie Grecque*. Paris: J. Vrin, 1971, pp. 254-271.

——. "Un Vers Méconnu des Oracles Chaldaïques dans Simplicius." *Symbolae Osloenses*, 26, 1948, pp. 75-77.

Finamore, John F. *Iamblichus and the Theory of the Vehicle of the Soul*. American Classical Studies 14. Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1985.

Fowden, Garth. *The Egyptian Hermes*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986.

Gersh, Stephen. *From Iamblichus to Eriugena*. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1978.

Geudtner, Otto. *Die Seelenlehre der Chaldäischen Orakel*. Meisenheim am Glan: Anton Hain, 1971.

Grese, W. C. *Corpus Hermeticum XIII and Early Christian Literature*. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1979.

Hadot, Ilsetraut. *Le Problème du Néoplatonisme Alexandrin: Hiérocles et Simplicius*. Paris: Études Augustiniennes, 1978.

Hadot, Pierre. "Bilan et perspectives sur les Oracles Chaldaïques." In H. Lewy, *Chaldean Oracles and Theurgy*. New Edition. Ed. M. Tardieu. Paris, 1978, pp. 703-720.

——. "L'Image de la Trinité dans l'âme chez Victorinus et chez Saint Augustin." *Studia Patristica* VI = *Texte und Untersuchungen*. Band 81. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1962, pp. 409-442.

——. "Neoplatonist Spirituality: I. Plotinus and Porphyry." In *Classical Mediterranean Spirituality*. Ed. A. H. Armstrong. New York: Crossroad, 1986, pp. 230-249.

——. *Porphyre et Victorinus*. 2 vols. Paris: Études Augustiniennes, 1968.

Hirschle, Maurus. *Sprachphilosophie und Namenmagie im Neuplatonismus*. Meisenheim am Glan: Verlag Anton Hain, 1979.

Keizer, Lewis S. *The Eighth Reveals the Ninth: A New Hermetic Initiation Disclosure (Tractate 6, Nag Hammadi Codex VI)*. Seaside, CA: Academy of Arts and Humanities, 1974.

Kissling, Robert Christian. "The ΟΧΗΜΑ-ΠΝΕΥΜΑ of the Neo-Platonists and the De Insomniis of Synesius of Cyrene." *American Journal of Philology*, 43, 1922, pp. 318-330.

Koenen, Ludwig. "From Baptism to the Gnosis of Manichaeism." In *The Rediscovery of Gnosticism*. Vol. II: *Sethian Gnosticism*. Ed. B. Layton. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1981, pp. 734-756.

Lacombrade, Christian. *Synésios de Cyrene: Hellène et Chrétien*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1951.

Lewy, Hans. *Chaldean Oracles and Theurgy*. Cairo: Imprimerie de l'Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale, 1956. New edition edited by M. Tardieu. Paris: Études Augustiniennes, 1978.

——. *Sobria ebrietas: Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der antiken Mystik*. Giessen: A. Töpelmann, 1929.

Lightstone, Jack N. *The Commerce of the Sacred. Mediation of the Divine Among Jews in the Graeco-Roman Diaspora*. Brown Judaic Studies 59. Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1984.

Lobeck, Christian Augustus. *Aglaophamus*. 2 vols. Königsberg, 1829; rpt. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1961.

Logan, A. H. B. "The Meaning of the Term 'the All' in Gnostic Thought." *Studia Patristica* XIV = *Texte und Untersuchungen*. Band 117. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1976.

Manchester, Peter. "The Religious Experience of Time and Eternity." In *Classical Mediterranean Spirituality*. Ed. A. H. Armstrong. New York: Crossroads, 1986, pp. 384-407.

Marcovitch, Miroslav. "Oraculum Chaldaicum 159 Des Places." *American Journal of Philology*, 96, 1975, p. 30.

Merlan, Philip. "Plotinus and Magic." *Isis*, 44, 1953, pp. 341-348.

——. "Religion and Philosophy from Plato's *Phaedo* to the Chaldean Oracles." *Journal of the History of Philosophy*, I, 1963, pp. 163-176.

Miller, Patricia Cox. "In Praise of Nonsense." In *Classical Mediterranean Spirituality*. Ed. A. H. Armstrong. New York: Crossroads, 1986, pp. 481-505.

Nilsson, Martin P. *Geschichte der griechischen Religion*. 2 vols. 2nd ed. München: Beck, 1955-1961.

——. *Greek Piety*. Trans. H. J. Rose. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1948; rpt. New York: W. W. Norton and Company, Inc., 1969.

Nock, Arthur Darby. "The Lizard in Magic and Religion." *Magical Texts from a Bilingual Papyrus in the British Museum. Proc. Brit. Acad.*, 17, 1931, pp. 235-287; rpt in A. D. Nock, *Essays on Religion and the Ancient World*, I. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1972, pp. 271-276.

——. "A Vision of Mandulis Aion." *Harvard Theolgical Review*, 27, 1934, pp. 53-104; rpt. in A. D. Nock, *Essays on Religion and the Ancient World*, I. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1972, pp. 357-400.

O'Meara, John J. *Porphyry's Philosophy from Oracles in Augustine*. Paris: Études Augustiniennes, 1959.

Pearson, Birger. "Gnosticism as Platonism: With Special Reference to Marsanes (NHC 10,1)". *Harvard Theological Review*, 77, 1984, pp. 55-72.

——. "The Tractate Marsanes (NHC X) and the Platonic Tradition." *Gnosis: Festschrift für Hans Jonas*. Ed. B. Aland. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1978, pp. 373-384.

Rist, John M. "Mysticism and Transcendence in Later Neoplatonism." *Hermes*, 92, 1964, pp. 213-225.

——. *Plotinus: The Road to Reality*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977.

Robinson, James M. "The Three Steles of Seth and the Gnostics of Plotinus." *Proceedings of the International Colloquium on Gnosticism*. Stockholm, Aug. 20-25, 1973. Ed. G. Widengren. Stockholm: Almqvist and Wiksell, 1977, pp. 132-142.

Rosan, Laurence Jay. *The Philosophy of Proclus: The Final Phase of Ancient Thought*. New York: Cosmos, 1949.

Saffrey, Henri-Dominique. "L'*Hymne* IV de Proclus, Prière aux Dieux des *Oracles chaldaïques*." In *Melanges Jean Trouillard*. Les Cahiers de Fontenay, Mars, 1981, pp. 297-312.

——. "Neoplatonist Spirituality: II. From Iamblichus to Proclus and Damascius." In *Classical Mediterranean Spirituality*. Ed. A. H. Armstrong. New York: Crossroad, 1986, pp. 250-265.

——. "Les Néoplatoniciens et les Oracles Chaldaïques." *Revue des Études Augustiniennes*, XXVI, 1981, pp. 209-225.

——. "Nouveaux Oracles Chaldaïques dans les Scholies du *Paris gr.* 1853." *Revue de Philologie*, 43, 1969, pp. 59-72.

——. "Quelques Aspects de la Spiritualité des Philosophes Néoplatoniciens." *Revue des Sciences Philosophiques et Théologiques*, 68, 1984, pp. 169-182.

Schenke, Hans-Martin. "The Phenomenon of Gnostic Sethianism." In *The Rediscovery of Gnosticism*, II: *Sethian Gnosticism*. Ed. B. Layton. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1981, pp. 588-616.

Shaw, Gregory. *Theurgy, the Language of the Embodied Soul. A Study of the Work of Iamblichus of Chalcis*. Ph.D. Diss. University of California, Santa Barbara, 1987.

——. "Theurgy: Rituals of Unification in the Neoplatonism of Iamblichus." *Traditio*, XLI, 1985, pp. 1-28.

Sheppard, Anne. "Proclus' Attitude to Theurgy." *Classical Quarterly*, 32, 1982, pp. 212-224.

——. *Studies on the 5th and 6th Essays of Proclus' Commentary on the Republic*. Hypomnenata 61. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1980.

Smith, Andrew. *Porphyry's Place in the Neoplatonic Tradition*. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1974.

Smith, John Holland. *The Death of Classical Paganism*. London: Geoffrey Chapman Pubs., 1976.

Stroumsa, Gedaliahu A. G. *Another Seed: Studies in Gnostic Mythology*. Nag Hammadi Studies XXIV. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1984.

——. "Chaldean Oracles." Review of H. Lewy, *Chaldean Oracles and Theurgy*. New edition. Ed. M. Tardieu. *Numen*, 27, 1981, pp. 167-172.

Tardieu, Michel. "La Gnose Valentinienne et les Oracles Chaldaïques." In *The Rediscovery of Gnosticism*, I: *The School of Valentinus*. Ed. B. Layton. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1980, pp. 194-237.

——. *Trois Mythes Gnostiques: Adam, Eros et les animaux d'Égypte dans un écrit de Nag Hammadi* (II,5). Paris: Études Augustiniennes, 1974.

——. "ΨΥΧΑΙΟΣ ΣΠΙΝΘΗΡ. Histoire d'une Métaphore dans la Tradition Platonicienne jusqu'à Eckhart." *Revue des Études Augustiniennes*, 21, 1975, pp. 225-255.

——. "Un Texte Négligé de Psellus sur les Oracles Chaldaïques." *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, 73, 1980, pp. 12-13.

Terzaghi, Nicholas. "Sul Commento di Niceforo Gregoria al ΠΕΡΙ ΕΝΥΠΝΙΩΝ di Sinesio." *Studi Italiani di Filologia Classica*, XII, 1904, pp. 181-217.

Theiler, Willy. "Die Chaldäischen Orakel und die Hymnen des Synesios." *Schriften der Königsberger Gelehrten Gesellschaft*, 18, 1942, pp. 1-41; rpt. in W. Theiler, *Forschungen zum Neuplatonismus*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1966, pp. 252-301.

——. "Porphyrios und Augustin." *Schriften der Königsberger Gelehrten Gesellschaft*, 10, 1933, pp. 1-74; rpt. in W. Theiler, *Forschungen zum Neuplatonismus*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1966, pp. 160-251.

Trouillard, Jean. "Le Merveilleux dans la Vie et la Pensée de Proclus." *Revue Philosophique de la France et de l'Étranger*, 163, 1973, pp. 339-452.

——. *La Purification Plotinienne*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1955.

——. "Réflexions sur l'OXHMA dans les 'Élements de Théologie' de Proclus." *Revue des Études Grecques*, LXX, 1957, pp. 102-107.

——. "La Théurgie païenne." *Encyclopaedia Universalis*. Vol. 15. Paris, 1973, pp. 582-583.

——. *L'Un et L'âme selon Proclus*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1972.

Turner, John D. "The Gnostic Threefold Path to Enlightenment." *Novum Testamentum*, 22, 1980, pp. 324-351.

——. "Sethian Gnosticism: A Literary History." In *Nag Hammadi, Gnosticism, and Early Christianity*. Eds. Charles W. Hedrick and Robert Hodgson, Jr. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Pubs., 1986, pp. 55-86.

Underhill, Evelyn. *Mysticism*. 12th ed. New York: World Publishing Co., 1972.

Wallis, R.T. *Neoplatonism*. London: Duckworth, 1972.

——. "The Spiritual Importance of Not Knowing." In *Classical Mediterranean Spirituality*. Ed. A. H. Armstrong. New York: Crossroad, 1986, pp. 460-480.

Waszink, Jan-Hendrik. "Porphyrios und Numenios." *Entretiens sur l'Antiquité Classique*, XII: *Porphyre*. Vandoeuvres-Genève, 30 Août - 5 Septembre, 1965. Genève: Fondation Hardt, 1966, pp. 257-259.

Westerink, L. G. "Proclus, Procopius, Psellus." *Mnemosyne*, 10, 1942, pp. 275-280.

Whittaker, John. "Self-Generating Principles in Second-Century Gnostic Systems." In *The Rediscovery of Gnosticism*, I: *The School of Valentinus*. Ed. B. Layton. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1980, pp. 176-193.

Wisse, Frederik. "Language Mysticism in the Nag Hammadi Texts and in Early Coptic Monasticism I: Cryptography." *Enchoria*, 9, 1979, pp. 101-109.

——. "Stalking Those Elusive Sethians." In *The Rediscovery of Gnosticism*, II: *Sethian Gnosticism*. Ed. B. Layton. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1981, pp. 563-587.

Zandee, J. *The Terminology of Plotinus and of Some Gnostic Writings, Mainly the Fourth Treatise of the Jung Codex*. Istanbul: Nederlands Historisch-Archaeologisch Institut in Het Nakije Oosten, 1961.

Zintzen, Clemens. "Die Wertung von Mystik und Magie in der Neuplatonischen Philosophie." *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie*, N.F., Band 108, 1965, pp. 71-100.

# INDEX

## Greek words

Note: Words cited are found in the text only. Excluded are personal pronouns, prepositions, articles, particles, and the verb εἶναι. The first number indicates the fragment, subsequent numbers the appropriate lines.


ἄβατος 178.2
ἄβυσσος 216.6
ἀγαθός 11.2.3; 15.1.3; 214.3; 215.5
ἄγαλμα 101; 186 *bis*.2; 224.1
ἀγγεῖον 157.1.2
ἀγγελικάς 138.3
ἄγγελος 122.1; 137.1
ἀγέλη 153.3
ἀγεληδόν 154.2
ἀγήραος 187.1
ἀγητός 34.6; 42.2
ἁγιστεία 129.1
ἄγκτειρα 161
ἀγλαός 214.2
ἄγναμπτος 36.4
ἁγνός 1.10; 44.4; 88.1; 109.3; 226.3
ἄγνωστος 95.4; 126.3; 194.2 (*bis*)
ἄγονος 100.3
ἀγός 61.7
ἄγριος 224.4
ἄγχω 97.1
ἀδάμαστος 99.2
ἀδιαίρετος 152.3
ἀδιάλειπτως 140.1
ἀεί 12.4; 107.5; 135.6; 138.1; 215.3; 221.2; αἰεί 49.6; 163.6; αἰέν 163.5; 217.3
ἀειδής 163.3
ἀείδω 131.2
ἀεικής 223.5
ἀείπολος 61.18
ἀείρω 217.10
ἀέκων 223.3
ἀέριος (ἠέριος) 61.5.10; 73.4; 91.1.2; 216.4; 219.4
ἄζωνος 188.1; 195.2
ἀήρ (ἠέρος) 61.2.7.13.15.17; 146.3
ἀήτης 223.4
ἀθάνατος 96.2; 217.3; 219.8
ἀθρέω 147.1; 149.1
ἄθυρμα 107.8
αἴγλη 213.5
αἰγλήεις 218.4
ἀΐδιος 22.4; 70.4; 107.4
αἰθέριος 61.3; 76.4 (cj.); 86.3; 184.2; 193.2; 203; 213.5
αἰθήρ 51.5; 61.7; 85.3; 98.2; 221.2
αἴθρη 61.12.14; 67.3; 223.2
αἰθριάζω 224.7
αἴθριος 107.7
αἰνίττομαι 218.6
αἴσθησις 8.5
αἰσθητός 40.3; 41.2 (subst.).4; 210c.1 (subst.)
ἀΐσσω 217.10 (cj.)
αἰτία 39.5
αἰτιάομαι 15.1
αἰών 12.2
αἰώνιος 199.2
αἰωρέω 54.2
ἀκαμάτος 70.3
ἀκαμπής 79
ἀκλινής 213.3
ἄκλιτος 122.4
ἀκμαῖος 130.4
ἀκμάς 37.2
ἀκμή 2.1; 37.15
ἀκοίμητος 37.15; 87.2
ἄκοσμος 37.7 (cj.)
ἀκούω 58.1; 60.1; 100.3; 118.1; 158.2; 210.3
ἀκρότης 76.3; 82.3; 84.2
ἀκτίς 34.6
ἀλάομαι 215.3
ἀλήθεια 46.2
ἀληθής 45.2; 90.2; 107.2.7; 117.1; 137.2 (ἀληθῶς); 185.1
ἀλκή 1.5; 2.2; 32.5; 49.3; 82.4; 117.3; 118.4; 119.4; 214.6
ἀλλάττω 150.1
ἀλλαχοῦ 61.16
ἀλλήλων 39.8
ἄλλος 35.2; 36.2; 37.6.10.13; 58.2; 61.8; 65.4; 73.4; 108.1; 117.4; 136.3; 175.1; 184.1; 195.1 (*bis*).2; 220.1; 226.4
ἀλλότριος 196.2
ἄλλυδις 37.13

ἅλμη 133.4
ἀλόγιστος 196.3
ἄλογος 91.1; 156.1; 160.1; 166.3
ἄλυτος 160.3
ἅμα 42.1; 177.1
ἄμβροτος 112.1
ἀμείλικτος 35.3; 36.1 (subst.).4; 188.1 (subst.)
ἀμελέω 210.2
ἄμεσος 41.2
ἀμέτρητος 214.6
ἀμιγής 123.1
ἀμιστύλλευτος 152.2
ἄμοιρος 155.2
ἄμορφος 145.3; 163.3
ἀμυδρόω 34.4
ἀμφικαλύπτω 40.3
ἀμφικνεφής 163.4
ἀμφιπρόσωπος 189.1
ἀμφιφαής 1.6; 189.1
ἀμφιφάων 158.5
ἀμφότερος 8.4
ἄμφω 31.2
ἀναγκάζω 220.1
ἀνάγκη 24.3; 107.5; 114.3; 218.5; 219.1; 220.2; 221.3
ἀνάγω 99.4; 122.1; 131.1; 194.2
ἀναγωγός 46.1; 123.4; 190.4
ἀναιδής 89.2; 130.2; 135.4
ἀνακρεμάννυμι 58.2
ἀνάμνησις 117.5
ἄναξ 37.6; 218.4; 225.2
ἀναπέτομαι 97.1 (cj.)
ἀναπίμπλημι 43.2
ἀνάπνοος 124
ἀνάπτησις 119.3
ἀναπτύσσω 171.1
ἀνάπτω 126.2; 190.3
ἀνάσσω 214.7
ἀνατίθημι 202.2
ἀναχωρέω 225.1
ἀνδάνω 219.8
ἄνειμι 158.1
ἀνελλίττω 178.3
ἀνέχω 6.1; 213.4
ἀνήρ 7.2; 94.4; 98.2; 136.3; 215.2
ἄνθος 1.3; 34.4; 35.5; 37.15; 42.4; 49.4; 130.6
ἀνθρώπινος 160.1.4
ἄνθρωπος 15.2; 106; 154.1; 159.2; 160.5; 214.2
ἀνίστημι 110.3.5
ἄνοδος 136.2.6; 217.6
ἀνόητος 163.4
ἄνοια 213.1
ἀνοίγω 107.10
ἀνοχεύς 79
ἀντίκειμαι 158.2
ἄντυξ 167.4
ἀνυμνέω 197
ἄνω 6.2; 112.2; 116.2; 145.3
ἄνωθεν 65.2
ἀξιόω 129.2
ἄξιωμα 15.1
ἄοκνος 12.4; 49.6
ἀπάγω 135.6
ἀπαιωρέομαι 70.1
ἅπαξ 26.1; 35.1; 64.1; 169.1.2.3
ἅπας 22.3; 28.4; 30.3; 36.2; 73.5; 81.3; 189.3; 196.2
ἀπάτη 107.9
ἀπείριτος 214.6; 219.4
ἀπέραντος 39.6
ἀπεργάξομαι 66.2
ἀπέχω 156.1; 210a.1
ἀπλανής 64.1
ἄπλαστος 127
ἅπλατος 37.10
ἅπλετος 54.2; 61.3
ἁπλῶς 62.1; 70.1; 219.1
ἀπνεύμων 163.6
ἀπογεννάω 34.2; 56.2
ἀποθρῴσκω 34.3
ἀποκαθίστημι 153.1
ἀποκαλέω 102.1; 151.3; 210c.2
ἀποκλείω 105.4
ἀπόλλυμι 114.3; 170.3
ἀπορρέω 74.1
ἀπόρρητος 206.3; 223.2
ἀποσκεδάννυμι 217.9
ἀποστρέφω 136.4
ἀπόστροφος 1.10
ἀποτίθημι 119.2
ἀποτυπόω 167.1
ἅπταιστος 136.1
ἅπτω 194.1
ἀργαλέος 134.3
ἀργός 94.3; 163.6
ἄρδην 51.5; 112.2
ἀρετή 46.1; 52.1; 107.11; 182.1
ἄρθρον 210a.2
ἀριθμός 28.1
ἁρμόζω 39.8
ἁρμονία 71.2; 97.3
ἁρπάζω 3.1
ἄρρατος 36.3 (cj.)
ἄρρητος 150.3; 194.1; 219.7
ἀρχέγονος 37.16
ἀρχή 13; 24.3; 40.2; 49.5; 73.5; 74.2; 110.4; 168.1.2; 215.4
ἀρχιγένεθλος 51.4
ἀρχικός 73.1; 74.1; 75.1.3

ἄρχω 27.3; 34.6; 70.3; 74.1; 91.1; 133.1; 179.2
ἀσέβεια 15.2
ἀσθενέω 204.2
ἀσθενής 117.4
ἀστέριος 64.3; 107.6; 173.3; 216.6
ἀστεροπληθής 219.4
ἀστήρ 64.1; 147.3
ἀστράπτω 146.6
ἄστρον 218.6
ἀσφαλής 136.1
ἀσώματος 142.1; 143.2 (ἀσωμάτως).3
ἀτάκτως 136.5
ἀταξία 122.5
ἀταρπός 136.4
ἄτε 82.1
ἀτελής 13; 117.5
ἀτενῶς 1.10
ἀτεχνῶς 185.3
ἀτμός 134.3
ἀτρέκεια 182.3
ἀτρεκής 183.2
ἀτύπωτος 144.2; 146.4
αὐγή 35.4; 115.1; 213.3
αὐγοειδής 119.1; 120.1
αὖθις (αὖτις) 110.3; 160.5
αὐλή 202.1
αὐλών 75.2
αὔξω 118.2; 224.8
αὔτανδρος 170.3
αὐτογένεθλος 39.3
αὐτοζῷον 32.1
αὐτοκίνητος 174.1
αὔτοπτος 101; 142.2
αὐτοτελής 37.17
αὐτουργέω 68.1.3
αὐτοφία 190.2
αὐχέω 97.3
αὐχήν 99.3
αὐχμηρός 100.2; 134.4
ἀφανής 78.1; 163.6
ἀφανίζω 196.1
ἀφανισμός 105.4
ἄφθεγκτος 77.2; 132.1; 191; 208.1
ἄφθιτος 37.7; 66.1
ἀφικνέομαι 110.6; 219.1
ἀφορίζω 167.3; 215.6
ἄφραστος 56.4; 108.3
ἄχραντος 122.3; 219.5

βαθμίς 164.2
βάθος 112.1; 163.5; 184.2
βαθύνω 104.1
βαθύς 43.1; 183.2
βακχεύω 194.2
βάλλω 2.3; 107.1
βαπτίζω 114.2
βάρβαρος 150.1; 187.1
βαρυηχής 133.4
βασιλεύς 226.1
βέβαιος 47.1
βένθος 148.2
βία 159.1
βίβλος 226.4
βίος 160.5; 217.6
βλάστημα 88.2
βλέπω 55.1; 135.1.3; 147.4; 148.1
βλύξω 37.16; 51.4
βοήθεια 129.2
βουλή 37.2.4; 77.2; 81.4; 107.4; 217.8
βούλομαι 138.1; 210a.1
βρίθω 213.4
βρότειος 97.3; 129.3; 215.7
βροτός 25.2; 90.3; 113.2; 116.1; 121.2; 140.2; 141.2; 219.8; 225.2
βυθός 18.1; 163.3

γαῖα 90.2; 215.3; 218.2; 219.6
γαλακτοποτέω 210b.1
γαυρόομαι 71.2
γενεά (-ή) 56.5
γενεσιουργός 180.1; 181.1
γένεσις 34.3; 46.1; 94.1; 99.1.4; 138.2; 196.2
γεννάω 12.3; 94.1
γέννησις 12.2
γένος 7.2
γῆ 6.1; 65.3; 67.3; 105.1; 157.3; 164.1
γίγνομαι (γίνομαι) 145.3; 201
γλυκερός 217.2
γνώμη 215.9
γνώριμος 194.3
γνώρισμα 118.3
γνῶσις 41.3; 190.1
γραμμή 63.3; 167.2
γραμμιαῖος 63.3
γράφω 95.3
γύη 107.1; 146.5
γυμνής 116.2
γυμνός 146.8
γωνιακός 151.1

δαίμων 88.1; 90.4; 91.1; 93.1; 149.1; 157.3; 215.2.8; 223.6
δεῖ 81.1; 119.1; 140.1
δείκνυμι 90.3
δέμα 31.2
δέμας 98.2; 163.6; 224.4
δεξιτέρος 51.3
δεσμός 39.1.2.4; 42.2
δεσπότις 96.2
δεύτερος 7.2; 31.1

δέχομαι 56.5
δηθύνω 140.2
δηλαδή 16.1
δηλόω 22.2; 41.3; 80.1; 143.1; 174.1; 190.2; 217.1; 224.1; 225.1
δημιουργικός 165.3; 210c.1
δημιουργός 33.1; 53.1; 67.2
δήπου 212
διαιρέω 73.1
διάκοσμος 74.3; 83.3; 177.1; 198
διακρίνω 6.1.3; 42.1
διαλέγομαι 65.2; 75.1
διαμπάξ 65.2
διάνοια 53.1.2; 178.2
διαπόρθμιος 78.3
διαρρήδην 81.1
διάφορος 118.1
διδακτός 118.3
διδασκαλία 117.4
διδάσκω 51.1; 87.1; 160.2; 196.2; 206.2; 217.1; 224.3
δίδωμι 82.3; 118.3; 218.6
δίζημαι 110.1
διήκω 65.2
δίκη 210.1
δινέω 49.6
διορίζω 24.1
δίς 125.1
δοιοί 215.1 (*bis*)
δοκέω 51.1; 72.1
δουλεύω 73.5; 80.3; 81.4; 110.4; 184.2
δοχεύς 211.1
δρέπω (δρέπτω) 37.15; 49.4; 130.6
δρόμημα 64.3
δρόμος 61.3.18; 70.4; 73.5
δυάς 8.2; 24.1
δύναμαι 32.5; 143.2; 158.1
δύναμις 1.6; 3.2; 4.1.3; 5.2; 27.1; 56.4; 96.1; 122.4; 135.2; 136.4; 137.1; 150.2; 158.1; 165.2; 175.2; 206.3; 210c.1
δύο 12.3; 44.3
δύσκαμπτος 155.2
δύσμορος 113.3
δυσνουθέτητος 155.1
δῶμα 219.5
δῶρον 214.2.4; 215.11
δωτήρ 215.5

ἐάω 107.5; 167.4
ἑβδομάς 35.1
ἕβδομος 200.1
ἐγγίγνομαι (ἐγγίνομαι) 190.1
ἐγείρω 110.5
ἐγκάρδιος 95.3
ἐγκατατίθημι 94.4
ἐγκεντρίζω 143.4
ἐγκεράννυμι 82.4
ἐγκόσμιος 56.2; 201
ἐγκύρω 113.3
ἐθάς 70.5
ἐθέλω (θέλω) 22.6; 109.1; 220.2
ἔθνος 150.2; 215.3
εἶδω 15.3; 18.1
εἴδωλον 158.5
εἰδωλοχαρής 163.4
εἴκω 81.4
εἰκών 167.2
εἰλύω 38.3
εἱμαρμένη 102.1; 103.2; 153.1
εἱμαρμένος 102.2; 103.1
εἵμαρτός 130.2; 153.3
εἶμι 154.2
εἷς 10; 27.1; 30.1; 37.3.9; 63.3; 66.2; 84.2; 126.3; 168.1; 169.3 (subst.)
εἰσαΐω 222.2
εἰσδέχομαι 109.1
εἰσκρίνω 223.6
εἶτα 217.5
εἴτε 27.1; 214.3
ἕκαστος 150.2; 218.6
ἑκάτερος 197
ἐκγίγνομαι 10; 218.5
ἔκδηλος 68.4
ἐκδίδωμι 217.5
ἐκδότις 32.2
ἐκεῖ 59.2; 62.3; 226.1 (*bis*)
ἐκεῖνος (κεῖνος) 1.4.5.7.9; 4.3 (*bis*); 38.1; 46.3; 67.2; 69.1; 72.2; 80.1; 81.2; 109.1; 125.4; 132.1; 135.1.3; 191; 193.1; 215.8; 218.1.3; 219.2; 224.7
ἐκθρῴσκω 35.3; 37.4; 42.2
ἐκκόπτω 105.1
ἔκλυσις 141.2
ἐκπετάννυμι 112.2
ἐκροιζέω 122.4
ἐκτείνω 128.1
ἐκτελέω 7.1
ἐκτολυπεύω 68.3
ἐκφαίνω 67.1; 190.2
ἐλάτειρα 91.2
ἐλίττω 146.5; 163.5
ἕλκω 130.4
ἐλπίς 47.1.2
ἐμβλέπω 102.2
ἐμπελάζω 121.2
ἐμπέλασις 121.1
ἔμπληκτος 213.1
ἐμπορικός 107.9
ἔμπροσθεν 219.2
ἐμπύριος 2.4; 130.6; 165.3; 193.2; 203
ἔμπυρος 146.8
ἐμφανής 78.1

ἐμψυχόω 51.5
ἐναργής 41.2; 216.2 (ἐναργῶς)
ἐνδείκνυμι 132.1; 191
ἐνδέω 142.2; 143.2
ἐνδίδωμι 122.4
ἔνδοθεν 118.1
ἐνέργεια 22.1
ἐνεργέω 206.1.2
ἔνθα 65.4; 107.11; 134.3
ἔνθεν 34.3.4.5; 115.2
ἐνθρῴσκω 14; 34.5; 76.3; 87.3
ἐνιπή 87.3
ἐνκαρπίζω 118.4
ἔννοια 37.14; 38.2.4; 139.3
ἔννυμι 2.1; 42.3; 115.2
ἐνοειδής 152.3; 198 (ἐνοειδῶς)
ἐνόπλιος 72.4
ἐνοποιός 49.2; 66.3
ἐνόω 110.3
ἐνσπείρω 39.4
ἐντεῦθεν 99.4; 119.3
ἐντίθημι 95.2; 109.3
ἐντυχία 208.1
ἐνύδριος 216.3
ἔνυλος 90.4; 186.2; 191
ἕνωσις 167.2; 168.1
ἔξ 58.2; 200.1
ἐξάγω 166.1
ἐξαγωγή 166.3
ἐξαρτάω 41.2
ἔξειμι 118.1
ἐξέρχομαι 109.2; 166.2
ἑξῆς 61.11; 223.1
ἐξογκόω 57.2
ἐξοχή (ἔξοχα) 218.1
ἐξοχέτευμα 60.2
ἔξω 1.12; 84.3; 213.1
ἐξωστήρ 124
ἔοικα 37.12
ἑός 3.2; 5.2; 42.5; 82.3
ἐπάγω 8.5; 217.7
ἐπανάγω 110.5
ἐπαυδάω 149.2
ἐπαφή 41.2
ἐπαφητός 41.4
ἐπεγείρω 119.2
ἐπεγκλίνω 1.4
ἐπεί 1.12; 193.1; 220.2
ἐπείγω 37.8
ἐπέκεινα 5.2; 26.1; 35.1.6; 125.1; 169.2
ἐπεμβαίνω 76.2; 223.4
ἐπεύχομαι 224.8
ἐπέχω 42.4
ἐπιβαίνω 86.3; 216.1; 217.4; 219.5
ἐπιβήτης 216.5
ἐπιβήτωρ 44.5; 216.5
ἐπιβολή 41.3
ἐπιδέω 117.4; 220.2
ἐπικοσμέω 224.4
ἐπιλάμπω 49.2
ἐπιμέλεια 120.1
ἐπίπεδον 104.2
ἐπιρρέω 32.4
ἐπισκοπέω 226.3
ἐπισπέρχω 111.2
ἐπιστρέφω 89.3; 99.1; 168.1
ἐπισυγχέω 6.1
ἐπιφαίνω 219.3
ἐπιφοιτάω 2.3
ἐπίφρων 217.8
ἐπιφωνέω 146.2
ἐπιχεύω 14
ἕπομαι 58.5; 158.1
ἐπονομάξω 33.3
ἔπος 1.2; 219.7
ἐποχέομαι 36.2.3; 146.7; 193.2
ἑπτά 57.2; 58.2
ἑπτάκτις 194.1
ἑπτάπορος 164.2
ἐραστός 214.4
ἐράω 39.6; 134.5
ἐργάτις 32.2
ἔργον 5.3; 39.3; 40.2.3; 66.1; 70.3; 107.5; 110.3.5; 128.2; 130.1; 133.3; 134.4; 136.6; 215.9
ἐργοτεχνίτης 33.2
ἔρδω 223.6
ἐρρωμένος 117.1
ἐρύω 223.2
ἔρχομαι 70.5; 149.1; 222.2
ἐρῶ (εἴρω) 19.1; 40.1; 41.1; 49.1; 69.1; 105.4; 141.1; 175.1; 179.1; 193.2; 194.2; 217.5; 219.2
ἔρως 39.2.4.8.9; 43.1; 45.2; 46.2
ἐσθλός 88.2; 215.10.11 (*bis*)
ἕτερος 6.5; 68.2; 174.2
ἔτι 41.1; 221.1
εὖηχος 210.1
εὐΐερος 148.1
εὔλυτος 124; 125.3
εὐνομία 107.11
εὑρετικός 117.2
εὑρίσκω 222.3
εὐσέβεια (-σεβίη) 107.10; 128.2
εὔτροχος 111.1
εὐφημέω 72.3
εὐχή 222.2; 224.8
ἐφάπτω 41.1
ἐφέλκω 196.3
ἑφερμηνεύω 38.1
ἐφικτός 116.1
ἐφίστημι 41.1

ἔχω 8.4; 20 *bis*.2; 49.4; 69.1; 97.2; 105.2; 117.5; 121.2; 139.4; 140.1; 150.3; 166.1; 186 *bis*.3; 206.3; 213.3; 215.9; 217.2.3; 218.3; 224.2

ζείδωρος 32.5
ζῆλος 105.2
ζητέω 110.4; 165.1
ζῶ 136.4; 137.1; 156.2; 174.2
ζωή 56.1; 96.2; 114.1; 123.4 (*bis*); 156.2; 157.2; 189.3; 215.6
ζωηφόριος 65.5
ζωηφόρος 32.2
ζωναῖος 195.2
ζώνη 58.2; 188.1
ζῳογονία 65.1
ζῳογόνος 32.3; 54.1; 56.1
ζῷον 224.5.7
ζωοτρόφος 219.6

ἤδη 22.5; 35.1; 217.9
ἤχω 72.4; 158.2
ἡλιακός 58.3; 59.3; 61.9; 168.1; 184.2; 226.4
ἥλιος (ἠέλιος) 58.1; 60.3; 61.1.7.12.14.18; 70.5; 107.3; 185.1; 200.1
ἡνίκα 51.1; 148.1; 149.1
ἡνίον 127
ἡνιοχέω 85.1
ἠχέω 210.1

θάλλω 215.3
θάλπω 73.4
θεά (θεή) 54.2; 72.4 (codd.); 221.3
θεάομαι 117.1
θειόδαμος 221.3
θεῖος 28.1; 44.1.4; 47.1; 56.1; 66.2; 72.4 (cj.); 116.1; 122.5; 136.5; 140.1; 143.1; 165.2; 196.1; 208.1; 223.5
θέλγω 135.6
θεμιστός 217.4
θεόθεν 67.1; 97.2 (cj.); 121.2
θεοθρέμμων 16.2
θεολογία 67.1
θεολόγος 54.1; 60.1; 187.1.2; 226.5
θεοπαράδοτος 146.1; 150.2; 169.1
θεός 1.2; 2.5; 8.1; 11.1; 15.1.3; 19.2; 22.1; 34.1; 35.1; 41.5; 45.1; 48.2.3; 50.1; 54.1; 55.2; 58.1.2.5; 63.1; 72.1; 76.1; 80.1; 81.1; 82.2; 83.1; 87.1; 92.3; 94.4; 95.3; 97.1; 99.1; 111.3; 114.3; 121.3; 129.1.4; 130.4; 135.1; 136.3; 141.1.2; 142.1; 145.1; 163.1; 181.3; 185.3; 190.1; 194.1; 195.1; 197; 199.2; 210.2; 211.2; 214.2.4.6; 217.3.6.7; 219.5; 222.3; 225.1.2; 226.1
θεοσύνδετος 119.4
θεότης 169.1
θεουργός 1.2; 48.2; 58.1; 71.3; 87.1; 95.3; 129.4; 133.1; 138.1; 142.1; 143.1; 153.3; 194.3; 199.1; 210c.1; 226.5
θέρμη 53.3
θερμός 123.2.4
θεσμός 160.3
θεσπίζω 113.1; 210a.2
θέω (run) 39.9; 70.4; 221.2
θέω (shine) 137.1
θεώρημα 136.5
θεωρία 136.1
θήρ 157.1.2; 160.5
θηροπόλος 89.2
θητεύω 99.2.3; 110.2
θνητός 219.8; 222.3
θοός 146.7
θρησκεία 139.4; 140.1
θρῴσκω 90.2
θυσία 107.8
θυτικός 217.6
θύω 149.2

ἰδέα 37.3.9.16; 38.1
ἴδιος 3.2; 82.4; 95.3
ἱερατικός 137.2
ἱερεύς 133.3
ἱερός 73.3; 98.2; 107.10; 110.3; 118.1; 119.2; 139.4; 175.2
ἰθυντήρ 36.3
ἱκανῶς 190.2
ἵκελος 146.3
ἵππος 146.6.7
ἴσος (ἶσος) 167.4
ἰσότης 167.2
ἵστημι 78.3; 146.9; 147.4
ἴσχω 79; 96.3
ἴυγξ 76.1; 77.1 (codd.); 223.2
ἶχνος 37.8

καθαίρω 224.3
καθαρός 213.5
καθαρμός 119.2
καθαρότης 120.1
κάθαρσις 119.1; 133.1
καθαρτικός 46.1
καθέλκω 89.1
κάθημαι 8.2
καθοράω 146.2
κακία 105.1
κακός 88.2; 215.5
καλέω 38.2; 60.3; 89.3; 90.4; 92.3; 101; 108.3; 120.3; 121.1; 173.3; 210.1.2; 221.3; 225.1
καλινδέομαι 157.3

κάλλος 108.3; 165.3
καλός 214.4; 215.7 (subst.)
καλύπτω 147.3
καναχισμός 61.9
κανών 107.3
καρδία (κραδίη) 58.4; 211.1
καρπός 130.6
κάρτος 214.6
καταβάλλω 105.1.2
κατάγω 223.3
κατακλείω 5.2
καταλείπω 99.4; 158.4
καταμίγνυμι 215.7
κατανεύω 22.5
καταντικρύ 65.3
κατάρατος 159.2 (cj.)
κατασπείρω 125.2
κατασύρω 70.4; 172.2
κατάταξις 204.1 (*bis*)
κατατίθημι 94.2
κάτειμι 47.1; 65.4; 130.5; 138.2
κατεπαγγέλομαι 129.4
κατέχω 8.4; 168.2
κατοικίδιος 224.5
κατονομάζω 103.2
κάτω 6.2; 34.6; 163.2; 164.1
κατωρύομαι 162
κεῖμαι 37.1; 130.4
κελάδω 2.1; 111.2
κενός (κενεός) 1.11; 136.4
κέντρον 50.2; 65.1.2.3; 70.5; 111.1.2; 167.1.3.4; 189.3
κεράννυμι 29.2; 42.3; 44.3
κεραυνός 35.3; 147.4
κηλίς 196.2
κινέω 12.1; 77.2
κίνησις 174.1; 206.2
κλείς 197
κλείω 3.2
κληΐζω 7.2
κληροῦμαι 4.1
κλύω 148.3; 220.2
κοίλωμα 34.5
κοινωνία 121.3
κόλπος 28.3; 32.3; 35.4; 37.11; 56.4; 61.10; 90.1; 96.3; 189.1; 216.4
κοσμέω 72.3
κοσμικός 68.3
κόσμος 5.3; 8.5; 26.2; 27.3; 33.4; 34.5; 37.6.8.11; 39.1.9; 51.5; 57.2; 59.3; 67.2; 68.1.4; 70.3; 76.3; 79; 87.3; 96.3 (cj.); 108.2; 125.1; 134.2; 148.2; 163.1.2; 181.2; 184.1
κουφίζω 123.3
κοῦφος 217.10
κραιπνός 87.3; 140.2
κρᾶμα 157.2
κραταιός 35.6
κρατερός 218.5
κρατέω 214.7
κρατήρ 42.4
κρείττων 190.1
κρημνός 158.4; 164.1
κρημνώδης 163.5
κρηνήϊος 74.2
κρύφιος 11.1; 198
κυβερνάω 22.4; 48.1; 133.3; 216.1
κυκλοέλικτος 199.1
κύκλος 61.9
κῦμα 133.4
κύμινδις 210.2
κυρτός 63.2; 147.2
κύτος 186.2
κύων 90.2.4; 91.2; 135.4; 156.1

λάβρος 73.5; 134.2; 172.1; 180.2
λαγών 51.3; 52.1
λαιός 52.1
λαλέω 109.2
λαμβάνω 118.3; 217.5
λάμπω 27.3; 147.3; 148.2
λέγω (εἶπον) 1.2; 8.1; 18.2; 20 *bis*.1; 22.2 (*bis*); 36.1; 50.1; 51.1.2; 59.4; 64.2; 67.2; 70.1; 72.1; 73.1; 81.1; 82.2; 100.3; 118.1; 141.1; 142.1; 143.1; 147.1; 155.3; 158.3; 160.2; 169.1; 173.1; 181.3; 187.1; 212; 225.1
λείπω 159.1; 177.1; 219.5
λεπτός 120.2; 224.5
λέων 147.1
λήθη 109.2; 171.2
λίβανος 224.6
λιβάς 51.4
λιγυρός 210.1
λίθος 149.2
λογικός 114.1
λόγιον 5.5; 6.4; 11.4; 15.1; 17.2; 20.3; 21.2; 22.1; 25.1; 27.4; 28.2; 30.3; 32.1; 33.3; 34.1; 36.1; 37.1 (Χαλδαικοῖς λογίοις); 38.2; 39.2; 43.2; 44.1; 47.1; 49.1; 51.1; 53.1; 56.3; 57.1; 61.1; 62.3; 63.1; 64.1; 65.1; 66.2; 69.1; 70.1; 73.2; 78.4; 80.2; 81.1; 84.2; 91.1; 92.1; 94.1; 100.3; 108.1; 113.1; 116.3; 117.4; 118.1; 121.1; 129.1; 130.3; 131.1; 132.1; 133.5; 134.1; 135.5; 136.2; 137.2; 138.2; 139.1; 143.1; 151.1; 152.1; 153.2; 154.3; 156.2; 158.2; 160.1; 166.3; 167.3; 168.3; 170.2; 172.3; 173.3; 174.3; 176.3; 177.5; 179.3; 182.4; 183.1; 191; 192; 193.1;

196.2; 207; 210a.2; 210b.1; 216.2; 217.1
λόγος 59.1; 90.4 (= λόγιον); 110.3; 155.1.3; 175.2; 186 *bis*.3
λοιπόν 225.2
λοχεύω 107.6
λύω 225.2

μαγεία 78.1
μαθηματικός 167.1
μάκαρ 56.3 (subst.); 140.2; 160.3; 218.1
μακάριος 194.3
μάλα 194.2; 218.1
μαλάχη 210a.1
μάλιστα 82.1; 126.3; 217.6
μᾶλλον 174.2
μανθάνω 1.12
μαρτυρέω 1.1; 15.1; 73.2; 129.1
μέγας 34.1; 39.1; 70.1; 121.3; 196.1; μέγα (adv.): 32.5; 213.4
μέθεξις 35.2
μεθύω 97.2
μείς (μήν) 210a.1; 210b.1
μέλαθρον 217.4
μελαναυγής 163.2
μέλλω 107.10; 134.5
μένος 82.4
μένω 12.1; 33.1; 39.6.10; 49.6; 96.2; 138.1
μερίζω 37.5.10
μερικός 201
μερίς 122.1; 158.5
μεριστός 53.1
μέρος 61.12.14
μέροψ 97.1; 161; 215.4; 223.6
μέσατος 223.4
μεσεμβολέω 58.1; 200.1
μέσος (μέσσος) 4.1; 24.1.3; 50.2; 65.2.4; 73.2.3; 85.3; 177.2 (*bis*); 223.4
μετάβασις 160.1
μεταδίδωμι 125.1
μετάδοσις 123.5
μετέχω 66.3 (*bis*); 143.2
μετέωρος 123.4
μετουσία 121.3
μετρέω 1.8; 23.2; 31.3; 107.3
μέτρον 107.1.3; 156.1
μέχρι(ς) (adv.) 109.2; 162; 167.4
μηναῖος 61.9.18; 64.3; 216.5
μήνη 61.3.13; 107.5; 147.3; 224.7
μήποτε 150.1
μήτρα 30.4
μῖγμα 224.6
μίγνυμαι 6.5; 66.1
μικρός (σμικρός) 210.3
μίμημα 69.3
μιμνήσκω 37.1
μισοφαής 134.2; 181.2
μίτος 218.5
μνήμη 109.3
μνίζουρις 149.2
μοῖρα 130.2
μοιράω 37.5
μολύνω 104.1
μολυσμός 119.1
μονάς (μουνάς) 11.3; 12.3; 26.2; 27.3
μόνος (μοῦνος) 49.3; 214.7; μόνον (adv.): 34.2; 129.2; 160.1
μορφή 37.8; 145.2; 148.1
μορφόω 145.3
μυσταγωγία 146.1; 194.1
μύστης 132.2
μυστικός 8.1; 59.1

ναίω 53.3
νέος (νεώτερος) 199.1
νεῦμα 44.4
νεύω 141.2 (cj.); 163.2; 164.1
νῆμα 218.3
νήφω 15.4
νοερός 1.6; 3.2; 6.3; 37.5.7 (subst.).14; 39.7; 56.1.3 (subst.); 79; 81.2.3 (*bis*); 83.3; 111.1
νοέω 1.3.4.5 (*bis*).7.9; 11.3; 17.1; 18.1; 19.2; 20 *bis*.2; 25.2; 37.4; 39.3; 40.2; 41.4; 49.4; 77.1 (*bis*).2; 108.3; 116.1; 130.1; 145.2; 212
νόησις 53.1
νοητός 11.1; 20 *bis*.2; 21.1 (νοητῶς); 32.1; 40.2; 81.1; 113.2; subst.: 1.3.7.9.11.12; 4.1; 8.4; 17.1; 20.1 (*bis*); 28.1; 31.3; 41.2; 108.3; 111.1; 138.1; 179.1; 189.2; 190.3; 198
νόσος (νοῦσος) 134.4
νόσφι 223.5
νοῦς (νόος) 1.3.4.8.11.12; 2.2; 4.2.3; 5.3 (*ter*); 7.1; 8.4; 19.2; 20.1.2; 22.3.4; 27.1; 36.3; 37.2; 39.3; 42.2; 44.4; 49.4 (*bis*).5 (cj.); 69.3; 94.3; 108.2; 109.1; 115.2; 128.1; 134.5; 212; 215.10
νυμφεύω 163.6
νύμφη 216.3
νωθρός 141.2
νῶτον 54.2; 146.7.9

ξόανον 224.3

ὄγκος 68.2; 147.2
ὅδε 8.2; 19.2; 28.3; 29.2; 31.2; 37.16; 38.3; 48.1; 73.5; 76.2; 102.2; 107.8; 141.2; 156.1; 162; 163.1; 216.1; 217.4.9; 223.3; 224.8

ὁδηγέω 171.1
ὁδός 118.1; 171.1
ὅθεν 110.1.5; 146.4
οἴγνυμι 112.1
οἶδμα 146.3
οἰκεῖος 74.1; 167.2
οἰκέω 157.1
οἰκοδομέω 98.2
οἴομαι (οἶμαι) 182.1
οἷος 155.1; 170.1; 188.1; 219.1
οἶστρος 114.2
ὄλβιος 214.3; 218.3
ὁλκός 36.4
ὁλοποιός 83.2
ὅλος 44.1; 59.3; 67.2; 97.2; 148.2; 190.2
ὁλότης 59.1
ὄμμα 1.10; 112.1; 213.3
ὁμοίως 76.1
ὁμόνοια 44.3
ὁμοῦ 31.1
ὀμφή 185.3
ὄνειρος 223.5
ὄνομα (οὔνομα) 60.5; 81.2; 87.2; 102.2; 150.1.2
ὀξύς 55.1
ὀπισθοβαρής 155.2
ὁπλίζω 2.2
ὅπου 11.3; 81.1
ὅπως 70.5
ὁράω 26.2; 146.6
ὁρίζω 41.3
ὁρμάω 12.2; 40.1; 193.1
ὁρμή 61.3
ὄρνεον 210.3
ὄρνις 107.7
ὄρος 170.1
ὅς 1.2.4.5; 7.2; 12.3; 15.1; 18.1; 22.5 (codd.); 27.3; 32.1; 37.7.9.10.11; 39.1.9; 40.2; 42.2; 44.4; 47.1; 51.2; 56.1; 72.2; 73.4; 76.3; 77.1 (cj.); 89.1; 94.2 (*bis*); 97.3; 99.1 (cj.); 105.1; 108.3; 117.5; 118.1 (*bis*); 120.1; 122.4 (*bis*); 126.3; 138.2; 143.4; 158.1; 163.3; 167.1.4; 172.2; 173.3; 177.2; 180.1; 181.1; 194.1; 196.2; 210c.1; 212; 215.3.6; 219.2.7; 222.3; 226.4
ὅσος (ὅσσος) 16.1; 61.14; 80.3; 116.2; 218.4
ὅσπερ 218.6
ὅστις 68.2 (cj.); 137.2; 215.8; 217.8.11
ὅταν 22.2; 136.5
ὅτε 75.1
οὗ (adv.) 31.3
οὐδείς 97.2; 136.4
οὐκέτι 225.2
οὖν 119.1
οὔποτε 90.2; 107.7
οὐράνιος 73.1; 147.2; 173.3; 216.6
οὐρανόθεν 218.2
οὐρανός 6.1; 70.4; 73.1; 192
οὐσία 95.1
οὗτος 1.9; 12.1; 24.1; 25.2; 27.1; 28.1; 30.1; 32.2 (cj.); 34.1; 39.1.8; 46.3; 48.2.3; 51.1; 69.1; 72.1.2; 73.1.3; 81.2; 90.4; 92.3; 94.2; 95.1.3; 108.1; 110.4.5; 113.1; 121.1 (*bis*); 122.3 (*bis*).4; 129.1; 133.1; 134.5; 135.5; 136.1; 142.1; 144.1; 146.1.2; 150.2; 153.1; 158.2; 166.3; 169.1; 178.1; 182.1; 187.1; 199.1 (cj.); 195.1; 215.2; 217.1; 218.6; 224.2
οὕτως (οὕτω) 22.1; 26.1; 53.1; 56.2; 82.2; 93.1; 121.1; 167.2; 198; 210.1.2; 219.1
ὄφρα 1.12; 23.2; 39.6; 42.3; 70.4; 113.3
ὀχετός 2.4; 61.13; 65.1.5; 66.1; 110.1; 189.2
ὄχημα 120.2; 201

παγερός 133.4
πάθος 155.1; 213.2
παῖς 146.2.7; 210c.2
πάλιν (πάλι) 29.1; 61.6; 69.1; 72.1; 78.1; 99.4; 146.8; 214.5; 217.7; 220.1; 222.1
πάμμορφος 37.3; 186 *bis*.2
παμφεγγής 35.4
πανδεκτικός 202.1
πανομφής 223.5
πανοπλία 72.2
πανταχόθεν 39.1; 122.3
πανταχοῦ 4.1; 61.1
παντελής 72.2
πάντευχος 2.1; 72.2.4
πάντοθεν 127
παντοῖος 37.9
πάντροφος 67.3
παραγγέλλω 213.1
παράγω 110.4
παράδεισος 107.10; 165.1.2
παραδίδωμι 7.1; 44.1; 59.2; 63.3; 67.2; 76.1; 80.1; 83.3; 94.1; 146.1; 192
παράδοσις 8.1
παρακελεύομαι 48.2; 129.4 135.1; 139.4; 145.1
παράληψις 119.3
παραμίμνω 215.4
παράσχεδον 37.13
παρεγγυάω 210b.2
πάρεδρος 226.3
παρέχω 121.3; 167.2; 174.1.2
πᾶς 1.8; 2.3; 7.1.2; 10; 12.4; 15.1.3; 19.2; 21.1; 22.4.5; 23.2; 27.3; 28.1

(*bis*); 29.2; 34.5; 37.3 (cj.); 39.4.8; 44.5; 48.1; 49.2.5; 56.1.5; 60.5; 70.1; 78.1; 79; 82.1; 84.1.3 (adv.); 95.3; 107.8; 112.1; 143.2; 147.1.4; 165.2; 167.1.4; 179.2; 180.1; 181.1; 186.1; 186 *bis*.3; 196.2; 198; 202.1; 207; 210b.1; 210c.1; 214.2.4.7 (*bis*); 215.5.10; 216.1.3; 217.2.4; 218.1; 219.1; 84.3 (adv.); τὰ πάντα: 23.2; 30.4; 39.6; 51.2; 53.3; 56.5 (πᾶν); 68.2; 185.1
πατήρ 3.1; 4.2; 7.1; 14; 22.1.3.4 (cj.); 27.1 (*bis*); 29.2; 36.3; 37.2; 38.3; 39.2.7; 40.2; 49.3; 57.2; 78.5; 81.4; 87.3; 94.4; 96.1; 107.4; 115.1; 130.1; 134.5; 165.2; 171.1; 175.1; 202.1; 213.5; τῶν πατέρων: 16.3; 50.2; τοὺς πατέρας: 73.2; οἱ πατέρες: 78.1
πατρικός 11.3; 13; 18.1; 37.14; 38.2; 39.4; 49.4; 53.2; 108.2; 109.1.3; 202.1
πατρογενής 35.5; 49.1
πατρόθεν 37.4; 77.1; 130.5
πειθανάγκη 219.2
πειθηνίς 81.4
πείθω 59.4; 88.1
πειθώ 14; 219.7
πέλω 52.1; 69.3; 97.3; 214.2
πελώριος 107.1
πέμπτος 65.4
πέμπω 94.2; 115.2; 136.4
πέντε 65.2
περατόω 167.2
περάω 160.5
περιάγω 78.2
περιβάλλω 39.1
περίβλημα 129.3
περιέχω 28.1; 36.1; 198
περιλαμβάνω 82.1
περιλάμπω 122.3
περίρρανσις 133.2
περιφέρεια 167.1
πηγαῖος 42.4; 216.3
πήγανον 224.4
πηγή 30.1; 30.2 (*bis*).3; 34.1 (*bis*); 36.1; 37.3.9.14.17; 49.5; 51.2; 54.1; 56.1.3; 74.1; 102.1; 165.3; 188.2; 207
πήρος 163.5
πικρός 129.3
πίπτω 39.7; 153.3
πιστεύω 88.1
πίστις 46.2
πλανάω 200.1
πλατύς 61.17; 107.7
πλεῖστος 158.2
πλείων 217.5
πλέον 146.6
πλῆθος 75.1; 154.1
πλημμελῶς 136.5
πλήρης 122.3; 226.4
πληρόω 32.4
πλήρωμα 96.3
πλούσιος 146.5
πνεῦμα 29.2; 35.6; 61.7; 104.1; 123.2.4; 170.1; 196.3; 216.3
πνιγμός 45.2
πόθεν 110.4
πόθος 217.2
ποιέω 67.2; 120.1; 122.3; 123.1.4; 136.1.6; 177.1; 224.1.4
ποινή 161.1
ποῖος 215.9; 224.1
ποιητής 68.1
πολλάκις 147.1
πόλος 35.6; 226.3
πολύμορφος 37.6
πολυποίκιλος 34.3
πολύς 30.1; 37.14 (πουλύ); 49.3 (πολύ); 51.4; 63.3; 76.1.2; 80.1; 96.3; 115.2; 129.2; 156.1; 172.2; 174.2 (πολύ); 219.5 (πολύ)
πολυφράδμων 222.2
πολύφρων 182.3
πολυχεύμων 93.2
πονηρός 156.2
πορεία 190.3
ποταμός 186.1
ποῦς 176.2
πρᾶγμα 190.1
πρᾶξις 215.10
πρεπόντως 41.1
πρεσβύτης 199.1
πρηστήρ 34.4; 81.3; 82.3
πρηστηροδόχος 35.4
πρίν 135.1.3
προάγω 78.1
προβάλλω 35.1; 46.1
πρόειμι 31.2; 65.1
προέρχομαι 28.2
προθέω 146.4
προΐημι 52.2; 65.1; 189.2
προΐστημι 217.6
προκαθηγέομαι 133.1; 190.3
προνοέω 114.1
πρόοδος 136.3; 145.3; 189.2.3
προπόρευμα 64.1.3; 107.6
προσαγόρευμα 34.1
προσαιρέομαι 215.8
πρόσγειος 149.1
προσείρω 39.2; 45.3; 53.1; 72.2
προσεχῶς 41.1; 216.1
προσήκω 187.1
προστίθημι 39.5; 132.1; 135.5
προτείνω 145.2

πρότερον 135.1
προτίθημι 37.7
προφέρω 215.10
προφεύγω 215.11
προχέω 56.5; 218.2
πρώτιστος 22.4 (cj.); 36.1; 102.1; 139.4; 175.1
πρωτογενής 173.2
πρῶτος 5.2; 6.5; 7.2; 11.1; 31.1.2.3; 35.1; 37.16; 38.1 (πρώτως); 42.2; 56.4; 73.3; 74.1; 85.1; 133.3; 175.2
πτερόν 130.2
πτέρυξ 217.10
πυκάζω 146.8
πῦρ 3.2; 5.2; 6.5 (*bis*); 10; 32.2.5; 34.4; 35.5; 36.4; 37.5.15; 38.3; 42.3 (*bis*).4; 51.5; 58.3; 60.2 (*bis*).4; 65.5; 66.1; 67.3; 68.2; 73.4; 81.3; 85.2; 96.1; 121.2; 122.2.4; 127; 133.3; 146.3.4; 148.1.3; 171.1; 196.1; 200.2; 223.5
πυρήοχος 47.2 (cj.); 65.4
πυριβριθής 39.2.4
πυριθαλπής 139.2
πύριος 5.4; 33.4; 35.6; 76.4 (cj.); 128.1
πυρσός 126.2; 130.4; 190.3
πῶς 57.1; 110.2 (cj.).4; 122.1; 224.1

ῥᾳδίως (ῥηϊδίως) 223.3
ῥαίνω 133.4
ῥεῖθρον (ῥέεθρον) 172.2
ῥευστός 128.2; 134.4
ῥέω 31.2; 171.2
ῥήγνυμι 37.11; 170.1
ῥῆμα 109.2; 125.4
ῥίζα 105.1
ῥίπτω 176.2
ῥοή 56.3; 61.5
ῥόθιος 186.2
ῥοιζαῖος 146.5
ῥοιζέω 37.2.10
ῥοῖζος 107.5
ῥυπόω 163.4
ῥύσις 186.1

σαφής 221.1; 143.1 (σαφῶς)
σβέννυμι 105.3
σεβάζομαι 26.2
σειρά 203
σελήνη (-ναίη) 61.1.2.7.14; 216.1
σεμνός 44.5; 87.2
σηκός 178.2
σῆμα 90.3
σῆψις 134.4
σιγή (σιγά) 16.2; 132.2
σκαλαβώτης 224.5
σκίδνημι 204.1
σκιρτηδόν 146.3; 148.2
σκολιός 163.5; 172.2
σκύβαλον 158.4
σμερδάλεος 37.12
σμῆνος 37.12
σμύρνη 224.6
σοφία (-ίη) 107.11; 182.2; 215.8
σοφός 103.2; 217.11 (cj.)
σπείρω 28.3; 108.2
σπέρμα 118.2
σπεύδω 6.5; 115.1; 116.2; 134.2; 225.1
σπινθήρ 44.3
σπλάγχνα 107.8; 217.8
σποράδην 2.4
στάσις 134.3
στερέωμα 57.2; 203; 205
στήριγμα 107.9
στηρίζω 58.4
στιβαρηδόν 2.4
στοιχεῖον 39.9; 62.2
στράπτω 1.6; 36.4; 37.13
στροφάλιγξ 12.4; 49.6; 87.2
στρόφαλος 206.1.2; 208.2
στύραξ 224.6
συγγενής 169.3
συγκληρόω 82.1
σύγκρασις 66.3
συγκρίνω 42.1
συλλαμβάνω 177.4
συμβάλλω 196.1
συμβολή 151.1
σύμβολον 108.2
συμμετρέω 185.1
συμπίπτω 170.1
συμφώνως 69.2
συνάγω 107.11
συναθροίζω 107.3
συνάπτω 4.1; 48.3; 122.5; 126.3
συναύξω 103.1
συνδέσμιος 42.3
σύνδεσμος 66.2
συνδετικός 44.5
συνδιακοσμέω 210c.1
συνέμπορος 217.3
συνέπομαι 158.1
συνέχω 23.2; 30.4; 84.1; 189.3; 202.2; 204.2
σύνθετος 157.2
σύνθημα 2.3; 109.3
συννήχομαι 61.15
σύννομος 218.7
συνοχεύς 32.5; 80.1.3; 82.1.4; 83.1; 177.4; 188.2; 207
συνοχή 24.2
συνοχῆΐς 151.2
συνοχικός 24.1; 177.1

συνυφίστημι 91.1
συρφετός 194.3
σύρω 34.4; 63.2; 164.2
σύστασις 208.1
σφοδρότης 1.7
σχῆμα 63.2.3; 151.1
σῴζω 113.3; 117.3; 128.2; 129.3
σῶμα 37.11; 40.3; 68.3; 69.4; 94.3; 97.3; 105.1; 110.2.4; 116.1; 119.1; 120.1; 128.2; 129.2; 135.3; 142.2; 143.2; 159.1; 193.1; 204.1; 213.4; 215.7; 217.9
σωματικός 143.4
σωματοειδής 189.2
σωτηρία 129.2

ταλαεργός 15.3
τάλας 211.1
ταμίας 60.4
ταναός 1.8 (*bis*); 12.3
ταπεινός 171.2
τάξις 24.3; 28.1; 31.1; 81.2; 110.1.2; 122.4; 136.2; 139.4; 187.1; 190.2; 202.1
ταρσός 85.2; 107.7
τάττω 61.1; 215.4 (cj.)
τάχος 213.2
ταχύς 70.5
τείνω 1.11; 12.1; 34.6; 127
τέκνον 162
τεκταίνομαι 68.1
τελέθω 140.2
τέλειος 117.5
τελειόω 85.3 (*bis*)
τέλεος 39.1
τελεστικός 110.5; 136.1; 196.1
τελετάρχης 86.3; 177.3
τελεταρχικός 24.1; 177.1
τελετή 133.1; 135.2.6; 150.2; 206.2
τελέω 66.1; 135.3; 224.3.8
τέλος 37.4; 39.1
τέμνω 22.3.5
τέρμα 24.3
τέρπω 219.7
τεύχω 69.3; 214.4
τέχνασμα 106
τέχνη 33.1
τεχνίτης 5.4; 33.4
τήλοσε 213.2
τίθημι 44.5; 166.3; 217.8
τιθήνη 105.2
τίκτω 215.6
τιμωρός 90.4
τις 1.3.5; 6.3; 13; 41.5; 55.2; 69.3; 71.3; 110.1.5; 111.3; 166.1; 173.1; 190.1; 193.2; 211.2; 214.3 (*bis*).4
τίς 24.1; 81.1; 170.1; 177.1; 217.5
τιταίνω 146.3
τμῆσις 179.2
τοίνυν 11.1; 32.1
τοιοῦτος 60.5; 206.2; 225.1
τολμηρός 106.1
τομή 1.6; 107.8
τοξεύω 146.9
τόπος 16.1; 58.4; 158.5; 170.1
τορός 210.1
τότε 147.2
τρανής 87.1 (adv.); 121.3
τρεῖς 22.3; 48.1; 73.2; 76.4
τρέφω 47.2
τρέχω 107.5
τριάς 2.3; 23.2; 27.2.3; 28.1.3; 29.2; 31.2; 32.1; 44.1; 46.3; 48.3; 177.2
τρίβω 224.6
τριγλώχις 2.2
τριοῦχος 26.2
τρίπτερος 168.2
τρίτος 31.1; 32.1; 44.4; 73.4; 85.3
τριττύς 11.1
τρόπος 224.2
τροφή 17.1
τροχάζω 13; 56.5
τυγχάνω 217.6
τύπος 37.7
τυπόω 144.2

ὑγιαίνω 210a.1
ὑγίεια (ὑγεῖα) 210b.1
ὑγρός 91.2
ὑδροβατήρ 92.2
ὕδωρ 67.3
ὑλαῖος 65.5; 80.3; 203
ὕλη 5.1; 34.3; 78.4; 85.4; 88.2; 100.1; 105.2; 123.1; 129.3; 134.2; 158.4; 172.1; 173.2; 180.2; 216.6; 224.1
ὑλικός 105.2; 119.1; 122.4
ὑλώδης 76.4 (cj.)
ὑμενώδης 68.4
ὑμήν 6.3
ὑμνέω 74.3; 188.1; 195.2; 199.1; 226.1
ὕμνος 18.2
ὕπαρξις 84.2
ὑπάρχω 1.12; 20.2; 84.3
ὕπαυγος 216.4
ὑπέραγνος 129.4
ὑπερβάθμιος 176.2
ὑπερβαίνω 153.1
ὑπερκόσμιος (ὑπέρκοσμος) 18.1; 59.1; 193.2; 209
ὑπερουράνιος 16.1
ὑπεροχή 126.3
ὑπνόω 118.4

ὑποβαίνω 110.2 (cj.)
ὑπόγειος 170.1
ὑποδέχομαι 189.1; 202.1
ὑποζώννυμι 6.3; 35.5
ὑποθημοσύνη 219.6; 222.3
ὑπόκειμαι 164.1
ὑποκλίνω 75.2
ὑπόστασις 11.1
ὑποστρώννυμι 163.3
ὑποτίθημι 224.1
ὕστερος 72.2
ὑφαίνω 39.7
ὑφήγησις 190.2
ὑφίστημι 38.1; 54.1; 200.1
ὕψος 116.2

φαεινός 76.2; 96.1
φαίνω 37.8; 58.5; 68.4; 72.2; 147.2; 182.1
φάος 49.1; 115.1
φάσμα 142.2
φατός 218.3
φαῦλος 215.7.11
φέγγος 39.7; 125.3; 219.4
φέγγω 122.2
φέριστος 213.3; 214.3
φέρω 1.10; 107.4; 111.1; 211.1; 215.11
φεύγω 107.9; 130.2; 134.5; 154.1; 213.2 (*bis*)
φήμη 8.1; 59.4 (Χαλδαίων φῆμαι); 87.1; 169.1
φημί 2.5; 5.5; 8.3; 11.4; 15.2; 25.1; 27.4; 32.1; 34.2; 41.5; 44.1; 47.1; 55.2; 56.2; 57.1; 61.4; 62.3; 65.1; 71.3; 78.4; 91.1; 99.1; 111.3; 114.3; 116.3; 117.4; 129.1; 130.3; 131.1; 133.5; 136.2; 137.2; 138.2; 142.1; 144.3; 152.1; 153.1; 154.3; 156.2; 168.3; 170.4; 172.3; 174.3; 187.2; 207; 211.2; 214.1; 215.1; 216.2; 219.1 (*bis*); 220.1
φθόνος 105.2
φλόξ 1.8
φόβος 14
φόνος 134.3
φορέω 37.12; 50.2
φράττω 135.2
φρήν 2.3; 105.3; 107.1; 219.7
φρίσσω 55.1
φρουρέω 82.3
φῦλον 93.2
φύσις 24.1; 54.2; 70.1.3; 88.1 (cj.); 89.3; 101; 102.1.2; 103.2; 106.1; 114.3; 117.1; 134.3; 143.4; 155.1; 160.1; 180.1; 181.1; 196.3; 222.3
φυτόν 107.2
φύω 214.3

φωνή 146.4; 148.3
φῶς 2.1; 49.2; 51.1.5; 55.1; 59.3; 71.2; 111.2; 118.3; 121.2.4; 122.5; 145.2; 146.4.5; 147.3; 155.4

χαίρω 215.9
χαίτη 55.1
χαλεπός 135.4
χαλινός 213.4
χαλινόω 113.1.2
χαλκίς 210.1
χαλκός 210.1
χαρακτήρ 95.1
χαρακτηρίζω 11.2; 169.1
χαράσσω 37.9 (cj.)
χαρίζομαι 12.4
χατίζω 221.2
χείρ 210c.2
χεῦμα 171.2
χήραμα 51.3
χθόνιος 73.2; 90.2; 91.2; 135.4; 213.2; 216.4
χθών 73.4; 107.2; 113.3; 114.2; 147.4; 157.1.2; 162; 223.3
χόνδρος 51.3
χορός 165.2
χράομαι 81.2; 125.4; 208.2
χρεώ 1.9; 134.5
χρή 1.3.7; 113.2; 115.1; 135.3; 219.1; 224.1
χρῆσις 63.4
χρησμός 120.3; 215.1; 217.5
χρησμῳδέω 2.5; 163.1
χρησμῳδία 12.5
χρηστός 88.2
χρόνος 37.15; 39.6; 185.1.2 (*bis*); 195.2; 215.6
χρυσός 146.8
χωρέω 70.1; 225.2
χῶρος 138.3

ψυχαῖος 44.3
ψυχή 1.11; 2.2; 41.1; 43.2; 44.1; 51.2.4; 53.3; 89.1; 90.4; 94.1.3 (*bis*; ψυχήν cj.); 95.1.3; 96.1; 97.1; 110.1.4; 112.1; 113.1.2; 115.2; 120.2; 122.1.2; 124.1; 127.1; 129.1; 131.1; 135.6; 138.1; 153.1; 159.2; 160.1.4; 190.3; 193.1; 194.2; 196.3; 201; 202.2; 213.3.5; 217.10; 218.2.6
ψυχικός 56.1
ψυχοκράτωρ 86.2
ψυχοτρόφος 130.6
ψυχόω 25.2; 51.2; 53.3
ψύχωσις 51.1

ὧδε 221.2
ὡς 1.5; 6.1.3; 8.1; 12.1; 22.2; 28.2; 41.4; 58.1; 59.4; 62.3; 65.2; 73.2; 74.1; 78.2; 90.4; 100.3; 111.1; 114.3; 116.3; 117.4; 130.3; 132.1; 133.5; 136.2.5; 137.2; 141.1; 152.1; 154.3; 155.3; 168.3; 172.3; 181.3; 187.1; 191; 196.2; 206.2; 207; 213.4; 216.2; 224.3
ὥσπερ 25.1; 223.5
ὥστε 77.2

## Latin words

adapto 9.1
adduco 9.1
alius 9a.3
amplio 9a.4
animus (anime) 9a.1.4
appello 9.3
autem 9a.2

circumduco 9a.2
consulo 9a.1
converto 9.5
corpus 9.6

desidero 9.2
detineo 9a.3
deus 9.3
dico 9a.2
do 9.4

efferibilis 9.2
eloquor 9.3
excellens 98.1

fio 9.2

hic 9.2

igitur 9.1
ineloquibilis 9.3
intellectualiter 9.6
intellectus 9a.3
intelligentia 9a.1
itaque 9.2

merito 9.1
multitudo 9a.1
multivarius 9a.3
multus 9.6

noema (= νόημα) 9a.4
nomen 9.1

omnis 9.2.5

possibilis 9.1
possum (potens) 9.1.2

quidam 98.1
quidem 9a.1
quoque 98.1

responsum 9.4

seco 9.5
sepono 9a.1
sic 9.4 (*bis*)
sicut 9.6
solummodo 9.3
solus 9.2
sursumduco 9a.2

tamquam 9.1

unus 9.2.5 (*bis*); 9a.2.4

vadens 9.6

## Proper names

Ἀσσύριοι 67.1; 188.1
Αὔγουστος 210a.1
Ἀφροδίτη 173.1

Διόνυσος 226.1

Ἑκάτη 32.3; 35.5; 50.2; 52.1; 70.2; 219.2; 221.3; 224.2

Ἑκατικός 206.1
Ἕλληνες 103.2; 187.2
Ἔρως 42.2; 44.4

Ζεύς 215.4.5; 218.5; 226.4

Ἥλιος (Ἥλιος) 226.1.3

Λήθη 186.1

Ὄλυμπος 217.2.9
Ὀρφεύς 187.2
Ὄσιρις 226.4

Παιάν 131.2
Πάν 226.4
Πλάτων 9.3 (Plato); 72.1
Πλωτῖνος 166.3
Πρόκλος 26.1

Προμηθεύς 114.1

Ῥέα (Ῥείη) 56.1.3

Σεπτέμβριος 210b.1

Τίμαιος 94.2; 218.6

Χαλδαϊκός 37.1; 165.2
Χαλδαῖος 28.2; 58.1; 59.4; 194.1; 208.1; 210.2

## Ancient sources

Note: References are to the text only.

Boethius *Philosophiae Consolatio*
IV, 6, 38 (p. 82 Bieler) Fr. 98*

Damascius *Dubitationes et Solutiones*
I, 87, 1-4; II, 87, 14 Fr. 27
I, 147, 27 - 148, 1; 153, 20; 235, 4; 275, 28 Fr. 21
I, 154, 14-26 Fr. 1
I, 155, 11-15 Fr. 2
I, 290, 15-17 Fr. 177*
I, 291, 11-13 Fr. 24
II, 16, 6; 65, 16 Fr. 18
II, 16, 15-16 Fr. 19
II, 16, 18 Fr. 20 *bis*
II, 16, 20-21; 57, 26-28 Fr. 20
II, 29, 15-18 Fr. 12
II, 43, 20-21 Fr. 83
II, 43, 23; 59, 18; 148, 11 Fr. 152
II, 45, 10-12 Fr. 182
II, 58, 20-21 Fr. 179
II, 63, 20-23 Fr. 31
II, 67, 1-3 Fr. 30
II, 87, 21-24; 60, 2 Fr. 80
II, 88, 2-5; 59, 23-25 Fr. 76
II, 88, 7-8 Fr. 75
II, 88, 21-22; 87, 9 Fr. 203*
II, 125, 19-23 Fr. 82
II, 126, 22-23 Fr. 197
II, 128, 3-5 Fr. 63
II, 133, 1-6 Fr. 35
II, 148, 12-13 Fr. 207
II, 157, 15-20 Fr. 70
II, 164, 18-19 Fr. 50
II, 200, 21-24 Fr. 40
II, 201, 2-4 Fr. 78
II, 206, 10-11 Fr. 74
II, 217, 5-10 Fr. 73
II, 317, 1-7 Fr. 163

*In Phaedonum*
101 (121, 1-2 Norvin) Westerink Fr. 208*
341 (230, 30-32 N.) W. Fr. 91
359 (239, 3-4 N.) W. Fr. 62
371 (244, 20-21 N.) W. Fr. 131

*Vita Isidori*
§ 137, p. 115 Zintzen Fr. 176

Didymus *De Trinitate*
II, 27 (*P.G.*, 39, 756 a) Fr. 23
III, 21 (*P.G.*, 39, 904 b) Fr. 213*
III, 28 (*P.G.*, 39, 945 c-d) Fr. 214*

Hermias *In Phaedrum*
110, 3-6 Couvreur Fr. 174*

Hierocles *In aurem carmen*
111, 16-20 Koehler Fr. 119
112, 8-9 K. Fr. 120

Italicus (Michel) *Letter XVII*
III, 182, 19-22 Cramer Fr. 125

Jean Lydus *De mensibus*
I, 11 (3, 3-6 Wuensch) Fr. 113
I, 11 (3, 12-16 W.) Fr. 44
II, 6 (23, 10-12 W.) Fr. 26*
II, 8 (28, 1-5 W.) Fr. 28
II, 8 (28, 6-7 W.) Fr. 29
II, 10 (31, 16-19 W.) Fr. 153
II, 11 (32, 1-4 W.) Fr. 173*
III, 8 (41, 7-13 W.) Fr. 216*
IV, 101 (141, 1-11 W.) Fr. 215*
IV, 107 (147, 4-6 W.) Fr. 183*
IV, 120 (158, 10-12 W.) Fr. 210a
IV, 134 (161, 18-19 W.) Fr. 210b

Julian (Emperor) *Oration* V
172 d - 173 a Fr. 194
178 d Fr. 129

Marinus *Vita Procli*
28 (22, 24 Boissonade) Fr. 206
28 (22, 23-24 B.) Fr. 208*

Nicephorus Gregoras *In Synesii de Insomniis*
*P.G.*, 149, 539 b-c Fr. 224*
*P.G.*, 149, 540 a Frr. 222*, 223*
*P.G.*, 149, 540 b 4-5 Fr. 149
*P.G.*, 149, 540 b 11 Fr. 206
*P.G.*, 149, 604 a-b Fr. 219*
*P.G.*, 149, 604 b Frr. 220*, 221*

Olympiodorus *In Phaedonem*
77 (23, 3-4 Norvin) Westerink; 157 (68, 23-24 N.) W. Fr. 186 *bis*
105 (39, 11-15 N.) W.; 111 (42, 7 N.) W. Fr. 47
149 (64, 2-5 N.) W. Fr. 138

Porphyry *Philosophia ex oraculis haurienda* apud Eusebius, *Praeparatio Evangelica*
V, 8, 3-4 (155-156 Wolff) Fr. 219*
V, 8, 5 (156 W.) Fr. 222*
V, 8, 6 (156 W.) Fr. 221*
V, 8, 6 (157-158 W.) Fr. 223*
V, 8, 7 (158 W. ) Fr. 220*
V, 9, 1 (162 W.) Fr. 225*
V, 12, 1 (130-131 W.) Fr. 224*

Philoponus, John *De opificio mundi*
IV, 20 (202, 13-14 Reichardt) Fr. 221*

Proclus *Excerpta Vaticana Chaldaica*
I (192, 12-14 Pitra) Fr. 202
I (192, 13-17 P.) Fr. 122
I (192, 17-19 P.) Fr. 123
I (193, 15-16 P.) Fr. 171*
III (193, 17-24 P.) Fr. 105
IV (194, 31-32 P.) Fr. 175

*In Alcibiadem*
17-18 (40, 1-5 Creuzer) Westerink (intro. + v. 1) + 18 (40, 6-7 Cr.) W. (intro. + v. 3) Fr. 135
23 (51, 8-11 Cr.) W. Fr. 11
23 (52, 13-14; 53, 1-2 Cr.) W. Fr. 48
37 (84, 12-14 Cr.) W. Fr. 4
53 (117, 17 Cr.) W. Fr. 45
82 (177, 6-10 Cr.) W. Fr. 117
87 (188, 11-15 Cr.) W. Fr. 190*
113 (245, 6-7 Cr.) W. Fr. 154
125 (198, 23-24 Cr.) W. Fr. 186 *bis*

*In Cratylum*
20, 26-30 Fr. 87
20, 31-21, 2 Fr. 108
31, 12-14 Fr. 145
35, 2-5 Fr. 210*
51, 26-30 Fr. 8
57, 25-26 Fr. 18
58, 11-15 Fr. 36
58, 19-22 Fr. 35
59, 1-3 Frr. 152, 207
59, 19-21; 52, 1-3 Fr. 169
63, 25-26 Fr. 16
67, 19-20 Frr. 132, 191
74, 26 Fr. 191
81, 2-8 Fr. 56
88, 4-6 Fr. 116
96, 16-18 Fr. 168
98, 14-15 Fr. 71
101, 3-8 Fr. 133
101, 26-28 Fr. 210c

*In Euclidem I*
98, 17 Friedlin Fr. 11
99, 1-2 F. Fr. 12
129, 6-8 F. Fr. 151
154, 27-155, 5 F. Fr. 167

*In Parmenidem*
647, 6-7 Cousin² Fr. 188*
769, 7-12 Co.² Fr. 42
800, 18-801, 5 Co.² Fr. 37
821, 5-7 Co.² Fr. 54
895, 7-12 Co.² Fr. 38
941, 23-28 Co.² Fr. 81
941, 31 Co.² Fr. 80
990, 27-37 Co.² Fr. 136
1091, 6 + 8 Co.² Fr. 22 (vv. 1 + 3)
1094, 25-27 Co.² Fr. 141

*In Parmenidem* VII
512, 89-94 Steel, V. 2 = 58, 25-30 Klibansky-Labowsky Fr. 9
512, 94-97 Steel, V. 2 = 58, 30-33 Kl.-Lab. Fr. 9a

*In rem publicam*
I, 27, 27-28, 2 Fr. 15
I, 39, 17-22 Fr. 143
I, 111, 1-12 Fr. 146
I, 111, 28-112, 1 Fr. 211*
I, 137, 21-23 Fr. 55
I, 176, 22-23; II, 347, 8 Fr. 45
I, 178, 17-20 Fr. 66
II, 77, 7-10 Fr. 155*
II, 95, 9-11 Fr. 186
II, 99, 1-4 Fr. 99
II, 126, 14-26 Fr. 217*
II, 143, 22-27 Fr. 95

II, 150, 21 Fr. 54
II, 154, 17-19 Fr. 137
II, 156, 17-18; 347, 1 Fr. 100
II, 201, 10-16 Fr. 51
II, 220, 11-18 Fr. 58
II, 220, 12 Fr. 200*
II, 242, 8-12 Fr. 142
II, 309, 10-11 Fr. 156
II, 335, 29-336, 2 Fr. 204
II, 336, 27-337, 3 Fr. 160

*In Timaeum*
I, 5, 3-5 Fr. 201
I, 11, 21; III, 271, 11 Fr. 54
I, 12, 16-19 Fr. 33
I, 18, 25 Fr. 17
I, 34, 21 Fr. 194
I, 121, 21-24 Fr. 170
I, 211, 11-13 Fr. 139
I, 211, 19-24 Fr. 121
I, 212, 12-18 Fr. 140
I, 212, 19-22 Fr. 46
I, 286, 8-13 Fr. 69
I, 318, 13-18; 408, 19-20 Fr. 94
I, 420, 11-16 Fr. 32
I, 430, 6-7 Fr. 198*
I, 451, 17-22 Fr. 34
II, 9, 16-18 Fr. 60
II, 50, 20-23 Fr. 67
II, 50, 24-27 Fr. 68
II, 54, 5-16 Fr. 39
II, 57, 30-58, 3 Fr. 5
II, 58, 7-8 Fr. 86
II, 61, 22-25; I, 408, 16-17 Fr. 53
II, 107, 6-11 Fr. 65
II, 130, 23-28 Fr. 189
II, 144, 27-30 Fr. 193
II, 300, 10-14 Fr. 41
II, 312, 22-28 Fr. 111
III, 14, 3-10 Fr. 49
III, 14, 14-15 Fr. 178*
III, 20, 22-26 Fr. 199*
III, 36, 20-22; 55, 30-31 Fr. 185
III, 43, 12-13 Fr. 195*
III, 43, 13 Fr. 188*
III, 61, 8-25 + 234, 28-30 (vv. 14-15) Fr. 61
III, 83, 13-16 Fr. 59
III, 83, 14 Fr. 209*
III, 102, 10-12 Fr. 20
III, 110, 4-5 Fr. 92
III, 124, 26-29 Fr. 64
III, 131, 27-132, 2 Fr. 226*
III, 132, 32-33; 63, 23 Fr. 200*
III, 243, 16-21 (vv. 1 + 2) Fr. 22
III, 266, 18-23 Fr. 130
III, 300, 16-20 Fr. 196
III, 316, 9-10 Fr. 25
III, 325, 29-32 Fr. 180*
III, 325, 29-326, 1 Fr. 181*
III, 325, 32-326, 2 Fr. 172*

*Theologica platonica*
I, 2 (11, 13-14 Saffrey-Westerink) Fr. 43
III, 1 (5, 15-16 S.-W.) Fr. 126
IV, 21 (64, 11-12 S.-W.) Fr. 84
IV, 39 (111, 18-23 S.-W.) Fr. 85
264, 19-21 Portus Fr. 187*
297, 32-35 P. Fr. 114
317, 26-30 P. Fr. 102
324, 3-8 P. Fr. 72
365, 3-4 P. Fr. 4

Psellus (Michel) *Brevis expositio in oracula chaldaica*
*P.G.*, 122, 1152 c 3-4 Fr. 184

*De operatione daemonum*
*P.G.*, 122, 865 a (30, 8 Boissonade) Fr. 93

*Expositio in oracula chaldaica*
*P.G.*, 122, 1125 a 11 (v. 1) + 1124 a 1 (v. 2) Fr. 158
*P.G.*, 122, 1125 d 1-4 Fr. 166*
*P.G.*, 122, 1128 b 8 - c 7 Fr. 107
*P.G.*, 122, 1129 c 12 - d 4 Fr. 110
*P.G.*, 122, 1132 b 1-2 Fr. 164
*P.G.*, 122, 1132 c 1-3 Fr. 150
*P.G.*, 122, 1132 c 12 Fr. 79
*P.G.*, 122, 1133 a 4 + 12-14 Fr. 206
*P.G.*, 122, 1133 b 5-8 Fr. 147
*P.G.*, 122, 1133 c 9 Fr. 127
*P.G.*, 122, 1136 a 1 Fr. 106
*P.G.*, 122, 1136 a 11-12 Fr. 52
*P.G.*, 122, 1136 b 11 - c 1 Fr. 148
*P.G.*, 122, 1136 c 12 Fr. 101
*P.G.*, 122, 1137 a 1-2 Fr. 88
*P.G.*, 122, 1137 a 11-13 Fr. 97
*P.G.*, 122, 1137 b 11-12 Fr. 112
*P.G.*, 122, 1137 c 8-9 Fr. 104
*P.G.*, 122, 1137 d 5-8 Fr. 165*
*P.G.*, 122, 1140 a 3-6 Fr. 157
*P.G.*, 122, 1140 b 1-2 Fr. 128
*P.G.*, 122, 110 b 12 - c 2 Fr. 90
*P.G.*, 122, 1140 c 10-11 Fr. 7
*P.G.*, 122, 1141 a 1 Fr. 161
*P.G.*, 122, 1141 b 10-11 Fr. 159
*P.G.*, 122, 1141 c 7-9 Fr. 96
*P.G.*, 122, 1141 d 6 Fr. 14
*P.G.*, 122, 1144 a 8-9 Fr. 3
*P.G.*, 122, 1144 c 4 Fr. 124
*P.G.*, 122, 1144 d 1-2 Fr. 115

*P.G.*, 122, 1145 a 4 Fr. 10
*P.G.*, 122, 1145 b 1 Fr. 212*
*P.G.*, 122, 1145 b 11 Fr. 162
*P.G.*, 122, 1145 c 9-11 Fr. 103
*P.G.*, 122, 1145 d 7 Fr. 13
*P.G.*, 122, 1148 a 12-14 Fr. 109
*P.G.*, 122, 1148 b 14-15 Fr. 149
*P.G.*, 122, 1149 a 10-11 Fr. 77

*Hypotyposis*
23 (75, 19-20 Kroll) Fr. 89
28 (76, 2 K.) Fr. 203*

Scholion *parisinus graecus* 1853
p. 61 Saffrey Fr. 44
p. 64 S. Fr. 134
pp. 67-68 S. Fr. 135 (v. 2)

Simplicius *In de caelo*
II, 1 (375, 18-22 Heiberg) Fr. 6

*In physica*
613, 7-8 Diels Fr. 144
615, 6-7 D. Fr. 192
616, 33-35; 615, 13; 623, 34 D. Fr. 57
616, 35 D. Fr. 205*

*Suda*
IV, 650, 30 Adler Fr. 176

Synesius *De insomniis*
135 a-b Terzaghi Fr. 118
140 c-d T. Fr. 158
151 c-d T. Fr. 218*

Theodoretus *Graecarum affectionum curatio*
X, 22 Frr. 220*, 222*, 225*